STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
main,stks 205Ev13
Lutheran quarterly.
v.8 1878 Lutheran quarterly
0 0001 00658511 9

58.

REFERENCE

COLLECTIONS

04-79-761-9

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/vol8lutheranquar00luth

THE

STATE LIBRARY
HARRISBURG,
PENNSYLVANIA

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

EDITED BY

J. A. BROWN, D. D.,

WITH THE SPECIAL COÖPERATION OF

M. VALENTINE, D. D.
S. SPRECHER, D. D. A. C. WEDEKIND, D. D.
C. A. STORK, D. D. J. H. W. STUCKENBURG, D. D.

NEW SERIES—VOL. VIII.

GETTYSBURG:
J. E. WIBLE PRINTER, COR. OF WASHINGTON AND NORTH STREETS.
1878.

INDEX TO VOL. VIII.

Allentown Church case, 1.
Angell, James B., LL. D., Art. by, 65.
Augs. Conf. and the Thirty-Nine Articles, 79.
Augs. Conf., a Question Touching, 161.
Adam, 244.
American Addresses, Huxley, Noticed, 131.
Ancient Life on the Earth, Noticed, 313.
Ansgar, 501.
Atheism, Nat. Hist. of, Noticed, 301.
Astronomy, Newcomb's, Noticed, 307.
Apparition at Endor, 321.
Aughey, Dr., Art. by, 282.
Ascensio Isaiæ, 513.
Alcohol and the State, Noticed, 137.
Baruch, Ethiopic Book of, 333.
Baugher, Prof. H. L., Art. by, 119.
Baum, Dr. W. M., Art. by, 396.
Beginnings of Christianity, Fisher, Noticed, 141.
Behringer, Rev. G. F., Art. by, 244, 501.
Boston Monday Lectures, Cook, Noticed, 142, 317.
Bluffton, Noticed, 470.
Children's Songs, Noticed, 310.
Church Members, delinquent, duty to, 229.
Church of the Apostles, Noticed, 130.
Cyclopædia, McClintock and Strong's, Noticed, 130.
Cyprus, Di Cesnola, Noticed, 305
Daniel, Taylor's, Noticed, 310.
Democracy in Europe, Noticed. 314.
Dox, Rev. H. L., Art. by, 550.
Education, higher, without God. 278.
Emigration, Western, etc., 382.
Encyc. Brit. Noticed, 149, 298.
Epoch of the Mammoth, etc., Noticed, 300.
Faith, guaranties of, 218.
Faith and Philosophy, Dr. H. B. Smith, Noticed, 139.
Final Philosophy, Dr. Shields', Noticed, 137,
Francis Xavier, study of, 199.
Fifty years in Luth. Ministry, Noticed, 460.
Fulness of Christ, 582.
Gotwald, Dr. L. A., Art. by, 321.
Harmony, Gospel Studies in, 538.
Harmony of Ref. Conf., Schaff, noticed, 152.
Hartwick Seminary, 592.
Heb. New Testament, 363.
Hermeneutics of the N. T., noticed, 148.
Heilman, Rev. L. M., Art. by, 369.
History, Green's Eng. People, noticed, 309, 473.
Hull, Rev. W., Art. by, 592.
Iliad of Homer, Bryant's, noticed, 613.
India, Talks about, 152.

81711

Interpretation of Phil. 2 : 6, 7, 119.
Intermediate World, noticed, 469.
Khedive's Egypt, noticed, 308.
Last Times, noticed, 465.
Lectures on Preaching, Brooks and Dale, noticed, 150.
Life and Death Eternal, noticed, 467.
Lilly, Rev. A. W., Art. by, 220.
Lost Forever, noticed, 311.
Luth. Ch. and Creeds, 352.
Luth. Diet in America, noticed, 464.
Lutheran Monographs, 621.
Mediæval Ch. Hist., Trench's noticed, 615.
Memoirs of J. F. Marmontel, noticed, 610.
Mesmerism, etc., Dr. Carpenter, noticed, 132.
Ministerial Education, 369.
Morris, J. G., D. D., LL. D., Art. by, 79.
Ministry for the Times, 477.
Monday Chats, Mathews, noticed, 135.
Miracle in Stone, noticed, 152.
Nature, Poetic Interp., Shairp, noticed, 134.
Neurology and the Human Soul, 177.
Old Bible and New Science, noticed, 151.
Origin of the World, Dawson's, noticed, 129.
Parson, Prof. W. E., Art. by, 199.
Paradise Lost, A Study of, noticed, 464.
Prayer Cures, 93.
Pick, Rev. B., Art. by, 249, 363.
Power of Darkness, 550.
Polar Voyages, noticed, 132.
Relation of Am. Colleges to Christianity, 65.
Repass, Prof. S. A., Art. by, 218.
Rhetoric, works on, noticed, 473.
Richard, Prof. J. W., Art. by, 477.
Sacraments, Use of, 376.
Schodde, Rev. G. H., Art. by, 333, 513.
Scholl, Rev. Geo., Art. by, 93.
Scribes, Before and in the Time of Christ, 249.
Settlemeyer, Rev. W. H., Art. by, 538.
Stork, Dr. C. A., Art. by, 278.
Student's, Eccl. Hist., noticed, 617.
Supernatural in Revival, noticed, 312.
Turks, Among the, noticed, 144.
Use and Abuse of Denominationalism, 101.
Van Alstine, Rev. N., Art. by, 582.
Vocabulary of Philosophy, Dr. Krauth, noticed, 148.
Weiser, Dr. R., Art. by, 352.
Wynn, Prof., Art. by, 177.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF THE

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

JANUARY, 1878.

THE ALLENTOWN CHURCH CASE.

At the request of some friends, to whose judgment we defer, we print in this number of the REVIEW the "Master's Report," in the Allentown church case. This is done not in the spirit of contention, or to perpetuate partisan feelings, but in the interest of righteousness and peace. The case settles some principles of law, and may hinder similar controversies. The length of the document may weary some readers, but it could not well be shortened in publication. It is believed that to many it will be found interesting and valuable.—ED.

THE MASTER'S REPORT—FACTS FOUND.

1. Under the bill and answers I do not think there is an issue presented concerning the election of vestrymen. The validity of the election is not questioned by these proceedings. No allegation is made that respondents are improperly in office. If anything, the bill takes the ground in the parenthesis of paragraph 15, that respondents, up to the time of filing the bill, were the legal board of vestrymen.

It is a fact beyond all question, that this congregation of St. Paul's is divided into two factions, represented by complainants and respondents; that respondents came into possession of the church property through regular succession, and are now in possession. The sole and distinct issue in this

case is, do the respondents adhere to the doctrines for the encouragement of which the trust was created. According to this view, all the evidence relating to the election of 1869 and 1870, is irrelevant, except as it may bear on the charge of misrepresentation and deception in order to acquire the control of the church government, contained in the 16th paragraph of the bill; or on the question whether respondents have conformed with the decisions of conference regarding the election of Easter Monday, 1869. These points will present themselves hereafter.

2. Under the bill, paragraphs 2 and 6, the general answer, paragraphs 2 and 6, and Mr. Mennig's answer, paragraphs 2 and 3, I find, that the German Evangelical Lutheran Congregation of the Borough of Northampton, now City of Allentown, was organized prior to 1781: that in 1781 said congregation was connected with the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, and remained so until Oct. 26, 1872, when, by an election, the congregation decided to join the Synod of East Pennsylvania, and was formally received by that body, Dec. 2, 1872. That said Ministerium of Pennsylvania, for convenience in transacting business, has divided the territory over which it exercises jurisdiction, into five district Conferences. Its congregations in the City of Allentown are within the jurisdiction of the second district Conference.

3. Under the bill, paragraphs, 3, 4, and 5, the general answer, paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, and Mr. Mennig's answer, paragraph 3, I find, that on the 3d day of November, A. D. 1813, Mary Livingston conveyed a lot of ground to Jacob Martin and George Keck, Trustees of said congregation, and their successors, Trustees as aforesaid, the ground on which the present house of worship stands, in trust, and to and for the only proper use and benefit and behoof of the said German Evangelical Lutheran Congregation of the Borough of Northampton (now the City of Allentown) and its vicinity forever, for the purpose of keeping and maintaining a house of worship thereon: that several church buildings, (Rev. Joshua Yeager thinks four,) have been erected on the lot so conveyed, the one now in use having been built about 1855, and conse-

crated in 1856, according to the forms of the Liturgy of 1842, which at that time (1856) was the Liturgy in use in all the churches belonging to the Ministerium of Pennsylvania.

4. Under the bill, paragraph 7, and general answer, paragraph 7, I find that said Ministerium of Pennsylvania was incorporated as a body politic in law, by an act of assembly of 17th Feb., 1854, P. L., p. 733. Its corporate name is "The German Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and adjacent States." The Corporators were William Bætis, John C. Baker, Augustus T. Geissenhainer, Charles W. Schæffer, and the other members of the German Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and the adjacent States, as contained in their Synodical Minutes for the year 1853, and their successors, together with such lay delegates from the several pastoral charges comprised within the said Synod, as may be from time to time appointed by the aforesaid charges in accordance with the rules and regulations of the said Synod.

It is provided by the first section of said act, among other things, "that nothing shall be done in pursuance of the powers and privileges herein before granted repugnant to this act, to the Constitution and laws of this Commonwealth, or to the usages, principles and doctrines of the German Evangelical Lutheran Church, as expressed in its Symbolical Books, and more especially set forth in the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, and in Luther's Smaller Catechism."

5. Under the bill, paragraph 8, the general answer, paragraph 8, and Mr. Mennig's answer, paragraph 4, I find more of a legal argument than an allegation of fact. The only fact involved here is, that St. Paul's Congregation has been connected with the Ministerium of Pennsylvania both before and since the incorporation of the Ministerium, and sent its delegates, lay and pastoral, to the Ministerium regularly until the fall of 1872, when it withdrew. The legal portion of this paragraph of the bill takes the ground, that St. Paul's Congregation, by virtue of the act incorporating the Ministerium, became a constituent part of the Ministerium, and is thereby bound to the usages, principles and doctrines which

by said act of incorporation are enjoined and commanded to be observed by the Ministerium. The same idea is contained in the seventh paragraph of the bill, though not so broadly stated.

This position is not correct, the obligation of the congregations connected with the Ministerium was neither increased, nor diminished, by the incorporation of the Ministerium. The relation between them was in no way affected, but stood, after the Act of 17th Feb., 1854, precisely the same as it did before. In the Church, as elsewhere, organization is essential to efficient effort. Certain members of a community, entertaining a common belief, organize a church, that by their working together their spiritual interests may be best subserved. Within a larger district several churches find that the welfare of the denomination can be promoted by union, and they organize district conferences, or classes. Throughout still larger areas Synods are organized, with a general supervision, having in view the same end, the advancement of religion and of their own views or doctrines. In every instance the relation created is simply that of an association or society, the authority of which comes entirely from those forming it. The members concede certain powers to the organization, and to that extent, and no further, the organization can exercise control. Now, in the case of the Ministerium, it was organized in the interest of the Lutheran faith. It had been in complete working order for years before the Act of Incorporation, during which time its powers were exercised, and the obligations of its members borne. What change, or addition is made in the relation between the Ministerium and its congregations by that act? What new spiritual power is given, or what further exercise of religious authority is contemplated? None at all. An inspection of the privileges granted in section 1, the powers to receive legacies in section 2, to admit members in section 3, and hold land in section 4, will show that this Act was not designed in any sense to regulate the ecclesiastical relation of the congregations represented in the Ministerium. The administration of its religious government and discipline by

the Ministerium is wholly unaffected. It is evident from the Act itself, that the incorporation of the body was obtained with a different object in view; and that was wholly temporal, as distinguished from the religious interests of the Ministerium. They found that it would be advantageous to possess the privileges of a regularly incorporated body; to be able to receive and manage property, real and personal, and be recognized in law as a body politic. Therefore the incorporation was sought and obtained. This view is sustained by the Minutes of the Ministerium for 1853. Reference to page 14 shows, that in his annual report the President made this suggestion, "As we are now receiving a considerable amount of money into our hands which is to be funded, and as we have likewise the direction of the Franklin Professorship, may it not be necessary, or at least highly advisable, *to have our Synod incorporated.*" This suggestion was made in April, 1853; and, the incorporation following on the 17th Feb. 1854, it is a reasonable inference that it was in consequence of the suggestion. There is nothing in the words of the President on this subject, to show that the incorporation was sought with any reference whatever to the government and discipline of the congregations concerned with the Ministerium.

But, the complainants argue, the proviso at the end of section 1, binds the congregation to certain usages &c. It is noticeable that the statement of this part of the proviso in the bill is different from the words in the Act; also that the proviso itself relates *only* to the enjoyment of the powers and privileges conferred by the first section. The proviso is quoted above at the close of the fourth finding of fact, which see. The bill says, St. Paul's congregation, by virtue of said Act, is "bound to the usages, principles and doctrines which by the said Act of incorporation are enjoined and commanded to be observed by the said German Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and adjacent States." I do not believe the Legislature of Pennsylvania meant by this Act to enjoin and command the Ministerium of Pennsylvania to observe the usages, principles, and doctrines contained in the

Symbolical Books: or to bind the congregations connected with the Ministerium to the same. Nor will the Legislature pass such an Act. It would be an attempt by the State to control the church, to limit it to certain religious views, which never has been, and never will be, done in this country. The State says, if religious bodies see fit to bind themselves to certain doctrines, they may do so, but such obligation will not be imposed by the Legislature. The idea of absolutely rigid doctrines is repugnant. As more light is obtained, and human progress is made, some modification of religious tenets is to be expected. This is reasonable. Indeed the Supreme Court of our State has distinctly and forcibly expounded this doctrine in the case of McGinnis vs. Watson, 5 Wr., p. 9; or p. 16, they say, "But we should grievously misapply this rule, if we should interpret it as meaning that no congregation can change any material part of its principles or practices without forfeiting its property. This would be imposing a law upon all churches that is contrary to the very nature of all intellectual and spiritual life; for it would forbid both growth and decay; not *prevent*, for that is impossible. The guarantee of freedom to religion forbids us to understand the rule in this way." (See also the several pages following). Now, in the case at bar, the Court is asked to decide that the Legislature has said to the Ministerium of Pennsylvania and its congregations, you must observe the doctrines and principles of faith and practice found in certain books. Nothing but the warrant of explicit enactment would lead the Court to attribute such a purpose to the law makers. Certainly it will not be inferred from words which may mean something else. What the Legislature intended to say in this proviso to the Corporators was this; you are a Lutheran body; you have asked for a Charter from the Legislature: you can have it; and, giving it, we impose only two conditions, first, that you be good citizens; second, that you be good Lutherans. Do not do anything in the enjoyment of these worldly privileges to upset your charter as faithful followers of the great Reformer of the 16th century.

The defendants in their answer take the position, that by virtue of the charter incorporating the Congregation, it is independent (of the Ministerium), and is empowered to select a pastor &c. This Charter is in Plffs. appendix, p. 3 &c. I cannot find in it any thing affecting the relation between the Congregation and Ministerium one way or the other. It relates to different matters wholly. For the same reason that the charter of the Ministerium did not bind the congregation to the Ministerium, the charter of the congregation did not make it independent of the Ministerium.

6. Under the bill, paragraph 9, the general answer, paragraph 9, and Mr. Mennig's answer, paragraph 5, I find, that in 1842, some of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania withdrew therefrom, and formed an independent organization, known as the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of East Pennsylvania.

It is alleged in this paragraph of the bill, that the founders of the East Pennsylvania Synod "no longer believed, taught and practiced the usages, principles and doctrines of the Evangelical Lutheran Church as set forth in the Unaltered Augsburg Confession of Faith and Luther's Smaller Catechism;" and that they "had introduced and practiced in their congregations New Modes of worshiping God, and methods of converting sinners new in the Evangelical Lutheran Church;" also that the Synod of East Pennsylvania, formed by them, was antagonistic to the Ministerium; all of which is denied in the answers. The Master would be warranted in refusing to pass upon the question of antagonism between these bodies. The bill gives no specification of what the antagonism is. When called upon to decide this point between two parties in a controversy, the question presents itself on reading the pleadings: "Antagonistic in what? Is it in doctrines, or practices, or territory? Is it because one has more congregations under its charge than the other? Or possibly it springs from an eager desire to outstrip each other in the work of promoting religion by education, foreign and domestic Missions, which was one object the legislature had in view in granting their charters. In the Kniskern case, I. Sanford Ch. Rep. 439, where the question was a doctrinal difference

between two Synods, the bill alleges explicitly three particulars wherein that difference consisted. (See pp. 446 & 447.) So in this case, if the decree is to be based on the antagonism between these two Synods, the bill should distinctly set forth what the alleged antagonism is.

I shall go on the ground laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States in Watson vs. Jones, above referred to, and recognized in the decisions of our own State. See App vs. Lutheran congregation, 6 Barr, 201, and the Pine Hill church case, 12 Wr., 20, to wit: That it is an antagonism based on doctrines or forms and practices in worship of such a character that, if adopted in St. Paul's congregation, they would defeat the trust created by Mary Livingston's deed. Of all the antagonism which might be included under the 9th paragraph of this bill, this is the only one which can be considered in this case.

I fail to find, from the evidence, that the Synod of East Pennsylvania is thus antagonistic to the Ministerium, or that it was so at its organization.

What seems to me of no slight importance, so far as this question goes, is the conduct of these two bodies towards each other. How has the Ministerium treated the Synod of East Pennsylvania? and *vice versa.* If the Synod of East Pennsylvania was founded in hostility, by men who no longer believed in the doctrines of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, we could not expect fraternal relations to exist between it and the Ministerium. Now, what are the facts? The East Pennsylvania Synod was formed in 1842, by persons, who, up to that time, had been members of the Ministerium. Incorporated with the Minutes of the Synod of East Pennsylvania for that year will be found the Minutes of the preliminary proceedings in the formation of the Synod. By these it appears, that there had long been "in the Pennsylvania Synod a difference of views in relation to the specific efforts to be made for the conversion of sinners and edification of Christians by the preaching of the Gospel, as well as in reference to the revered and cherished institutions of our church in this country." A meeting of gentlemen interested was held,

and they came to the conclusion, that there was an unquestionable call for the organization of a new Synod, since there was no prospect of harmonizing the antagonistic views. Accordingly they presented a memorial (See p. 4 of Minutes of East Pennsylvania Synod for 1842) to the Ministerium, asking for the amicable division of the Pennsylvania Synod, giving their reasons. These allude in terms to the lack of harmony and the presence of conflicting elements in the Ministerium. This request was not granted. On considering it the Ministerium passed this resolution: "Resolved, That Synod can in no wise consent to a division of this body, but should any brethren consider it desirable to separate from us, an honorable dismission shall be given them as individuals, if they so request." The memorialists then withdrew, and in a meeting it was "Resolved, That we organize ourselves into a Synod to be called the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of East Pennsylvania; and adopt for the present the Constitution of the General Synod with such alterations as may from time to time be necessary." Thus the Synod of East Pennsylvania came into existence. While the memorial presented at that time distinctly recognizes the want of harmony, and conflicting elements, it does not appear to be a paper born of antagonism, nor does it disclose any difference of belief in the doctrines, or essential usages of the Church. It has happened more than once in the history of the Church, that Christians have found themselves at variance on certain points, and have been forced to the conclusion that the cause of religion would be best promoted by their separation. This was undoubtedly the case at the time now under consideration. But, further than this, unless this memorial is a falsehood on its very face, (which has at no time been asserted in this case), it was drawn up in a commendable spirit of Christian kindness. See the 2nd and 4th requests of the document, in the latter of which we find these words, "we desire to establish the most fraternal relations and maintain mutual good will between the two bodies thus created. And we pray that the blessing of the Great Head of the Church may rest upon us all, and prosper

all our plans for the advancement of his cause and glory." Before we can say this Synod was established in antagonism to the Ministerium, by men who no longer believed the doctrines of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, we must get around this declaration on the part of its founders, which the evidence in this case does not enable us to do.

So much for the organization. What was the relation of the two bodies afterwards? Ill feeling began to show itself at once. The Synod of East Pennsylvania felt, that, in dismissing its founders, the Ministerium had done great injustice to two of them. This gave rise to a peppery report from a committee, which wound up, however, in better humor, recommending the appointment of a delegate to the Ministerium. This was done. Rev. T. Stork was appointed, (see minutes of East Pennsylvania Synod, 1843, pp. 14—16, 24). Rev. Stork presented himself at the meeting of the Ministerium in 1843, but that body refused to recognize him, on account of some accusations mysteriously hinted at in a resolution to be found on p. 9 of the minutes of the Ministerium for 1843 (see also p. 7). Mr. Stork then returned whence he came, and reported in detail; whereupon the Synod of East Pennsylvania resolved at some length. The resolution in closing says, "meanwhile any further overtures for friendly correspondence will naturally come from the Pennsylvania Synod." (See minutes of East Pennsylvania Synod, 1843, pp. 14, 15). This coldness between the two bodies lasted some years, during which time they had little or nothing to do with each other. Evidently it did not spring from doctrinal differences. The origin of the next movement towards reconciliation is detailed by Dr. Hay, p. 200 of defts. notes. The personal appeal of which he speaks will be found noticed on p. 7, minutes of East Pennsylvania Synod for 1850. It was referred to a committee, whose report appears on pp. 11 and 12, which, after some expressions of a friendly nature, closes with an express denial of responsibility for the obnoxious circular, and repudiates its sentiments. This report was adopted by the Synod. On p. 24, minutes of same year, the Synod appointed a committee of three, "to establish friendly

relations," and open correspondence with the Ministerium, I have not seen a copy of the English Minutes of the Ministerium for 1851, the year when this matter was brought before that body. Its action, however, is found on p. 19 of the German minutes for that year, and by a comparison, the resolutions passed seem to be correctly translated on p. 8 of the minutes of the East Pennsylvania Synod for the same year. By these it will be seen that the Ministerium responded "cordially to the sentiments on the subject of Christian fellowship, expressed by the brethren of the East Pennsylvania Synod." The second and third resolutions deserve to be transcribed entire. They are as follows:

2. "That we fraternally recognize them (the East Pennsylvania Synod) as a Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and cordially receive their representative in our midst."

3. "That Synod from this time forth, appoint a delegate to represent this body in the Synod of East Pennsylvania upon the same terms as we are represented in the sister Synods generally."

To this the Synod of East Pennsylvania responded by passing the resolution found on p. 8 of their minutes for 1851, which closes in these words, "that we most fondly hope, earnestly desire, and fervently pray that the fraternal relations thus established may be perpetuated." Thereupon the interchange of delegates was resumed.

This question of antagonism is somewhat further illumined by events subsequent to the above reconciliation. It will be remembered that the Synod of East Pennsylvania immediately upon its formation (1842) joined the General Synod of the Lutheran Church of the United States of America, and is connected with it still. This General body was formed in 1820, in which formation the Ministerium of Pennsylvania took part. For some reason, not clearly disclosed by the evidence, the ministerium, in 1823, withdrew from the General Synod, was independent of it in 1842 when the Synod of East Pennsylvania joined it, and remained so until 1853. It would seem by Dr. Hay's testimony, that the steps taken to bring together the Ministerium and East Pennsylvania Synod

were "preliminary" to a re-union of the Ministerium with the General Synod. This object was further pursued in the Ministerium in 1852, as appears in the minutes for that year, p. 17. They then resolved to defer final action till 1853, and in the meantime to solicit other Synods also to join the General Synod. The 28th resolution passed at that time says: "That we have been led to these resolutions through the conviction that we all agree in the essential fundamental doctrines of our beloved mother Church, and that we are therefore also prepared for an outward union, from which we can expect a rich blessing. Which may the God of all grace grant unto us through Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour." In this they were warmly encouraged by their brethren of the East Pennsylvania Synod, as will be seen by their minutes for 1852, p. 17. The consummation of this plan was attained in 1853. In that year, the Ministerium renewed its connection with the General Synod, of which General body the Synod of East Pennsylvania was a member. On pages 17—19 of the minutes of the Ministerium for 1853, will be found their proceedings in this matter, which are both interesting and important, as bearing on this question of antagonism. The following is from the preamble: "Whereas, the union of all parts of the whole Evangelical Lutheran Church is highly desirable, and whereas, this Synod is deeply sensible of the duty * * to co-operate with our brethren of the household of faith in the promotion of every good work for the general welfare of all parts of the entire Church." Fairness of construction can infer from these words nothing but a distinct and fraternal recognition of the Synod of East Pennsylvania as a part of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, as forcible, though not so directly stated, as their resolutions in 1851, before quoted. In their first resolution they approve "of the principles laid down in its (the General Synod's) constitution for the government of the several Evangelical Lutheran Synods of which it is composed." Of these Evangelical Lutheran Synods, the Synod of East Pennsylvania was one. In their second resolution the same recognition appears, and these Evangelical Lutheran Synods are spoken of as "en-

tertaining the same views of the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, as these are expressed in the confessional writings of our Evangelical Lutheran Church, and especially in the Unaltered Augsburg Confession,"—a weighty statement regarding fundamental doctrines, to which allusion will be made hereafter. In their third resolution they retain their own constitution and form of government. In their first resolution they distinctly approve of the principles of government for the Evangelical Synods composing the General Synod. These two resolutions can be read together, only on the hypothesis that the principles of synodical government as laid down in the two constitutions are entirely harmonious. Any other notion causes a contradiction. The same idea, harmony in principles of government, is again brought out in their fourth resolution. The identity of principles in church doctrine and church life is so complete that they did not expect ever to suffer any change whatever by their connection with the General Synod. To which is added an instruction to their delegates to withdraw, in case the General Synod should require, as a condition of admission or continuation of membership, assent to anything conflicting with the old and long established faith of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. See also Dr. Schæffer as to identity of constitutions, plff's notes, p. 141. In their fifth resolution they "again earnestly request" all other Evangelical Lutheran Synods, not yet connected with the General Synod, to join it, "so that the individual parts of the Evangelical Lutheran Church may labor unitedly and more efficiently for the general welfare of the whole Church." Of these individual parts the Synod of East Pennsylvania was one.

In considering the foregoing conduct of the Ministerium and Synod of East Pennsylvania towards each other, it should be remembered that the act incorporating the latter, which according to the tenth paragraph of the bill is so subversive of Lutheranism, had been passed in 1847, and had now been in operation seven years.

From the foregoing it is difficult to infer antagonism between these two bodies from their treatment of each other.

True, there was an enstrangement: they pouted from 1843 to 1850, but they were not antagonists in doctrine. Their love for each other as brethren of the Evangelical Lutheran Church was only smothered, not extinguished, and during the period from 1851 to 1853 there was absolutely a climax of fraternity between them. Any attempt at that affectionate time to portray them as antagonists would have been regarded as heresy of the worst order.

This state of affairs continued from 1854 to 1866, when a rupture occurred; not, however, between the Ministerium and the Synod of East Pennsylvania, but between the Ministerium and the General Synod. This, the complainants say, was on matters of doctrine, and is evidence of the antagonism necessary to sustain this bill. The witnesses do not agree on this subject. Some say it was, others that it was not, doctrinal. The facts are, that the meeting of the General Synod at York, Pa., 1864, the delegates from the Franckean Synod were admitted. This was "a great shock to the Synod of Pennsylvania." Its delegates filed a protest, and withdrew from that session to report to their own Ministerium. Their action was approved by that body; but it did not withdraw from the General Synod. In 1865 the Ministerium as usual appointed its delegates to attend the next session of the General Synod to be held at Fort Wayne, Ind., in 1866, and those delegates went to the meeting. Upon offering to present their credentials, the chairman ruled that they could not take part in the organization of the General Synod, because the Ministerium had for practical purposes withdrawn at the York meeting, in 1864. The decision of the chair was appealed from, but sustained. The General Synod referred the matter to a committee, which reported, and the delegates from the Ministerium responded to that report. Reconciliation was not effected, and the delegates from the Ministerium went home, reported to that body, and were sustained. All the facts of this separation will be found in minute detail in a pamphlet entitled "The Synod of Pennsylvania and the late Convention at Fort Wayne, Ind., 1866," which is an appendix to the minutes of the Ministerium for 1866. This book,

coming from the Ministerium, would be expected to show the doctrinal character of their withdrawal from the General Synod; but it shows just the contrary. It shows that the dispute was a mixture of parliamentary law and dignity, and to this especial attention is called. Beyond question, the objection of the delegates from the Ministerium to the reception of the Franckean delegates, at York was on doctrinal matters, and they withdrew accordingly, not, however, with the intention of disconnecting the Ministerium from the General Synod, but simply to report. After this withdrawal, the conduct of the General Synod was so conciliatory, that the doctrinal offence given the Ministerium at York was entirely blotted out, and the Ministerium felt "that it was the duty of the Mother Synod (itself) that had made such earnest efforts to induce other Synods to unite with the General Synod in 1853, to retain its connection undisturbed, and to labor on in the General Synod for the welfare of our beloved Evangelical Lutheran Zion in this land." Therefore, in 1865, when the Ministerium met at Easton, it resolved to maintain its connection with the General Synod, and sent its delegates to Fort Wayne in 1866; but they were not received. From that point, when the delegates from the Ministerium were not recognized at Fort Wayne, on through all this controversy, not one word of doctrine appears. It is parliamentary law, the President's ruling and the action of the General Synod in sustaining him, from beginning to end. In the pamphlet, above referred to, will be found the "Response of the Pennsylvania delegation," in which the whole dispute is thorougly gone over from the start. On pp. 16 and 17, the adjustment of the doctrinal difficulties at York is thus set out: "The reception of the Franckean Synod was, it must be confessed, a great shock to the Synod of Pennsylvania, * * but the subsequent conservative churchly action of the General Synod inspired new confidence, and led the Synod of Pennsylvania to retain its old relation undisturbed, hoping thus to promote the cause of the unity and the purity of our Church." On pp. 18 and 19 is "a clear and succint statement" of their grievances. This statement comprises nine heads, and there

is not in them all a line of complaint on matters of doctrine. All relate to the ruling of the chairman and the action of the General Synod in connection therewith. A curious fact in this affair is that one of the delegates who signed the clear and succinct statement, in which no matter of doctrine appears, was a witness in this case, and testified that "the real cause of the action at Fort Wayne was doctrinal diversity." Either this witness is mistaken, or the delegates made a lamentable failure in drawing up their statement.

The upshot of the whole matter was, the Ministerium was never represented in the General Synod again. The separation was final after the Fort Wayne meeting. It took part in forming the General Council, the first convention of which was held at Fort Wayne, Indiana, 1867. With this general body it is still in harmonious connection. The Synod of East Pennsylvania remains with the General Synod.

This review of the history of these ecclesiastical bodies brings out in clearer light the relation of the parties in this controversy to each other. On the one side, we have the General Council, the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, and the complainants; on the other, the General Synod, the Synod of East Pennsylvania, and the respondents. St. Paul's congregation was connected with the Ministerium until December, 1872, when it became connected with the Synod of East Pennsylvania.

This doctrinal antagonism rests, as indicated by the evidence and argument, though not specified in the bill, on the two following propositions, first, the East Pennsylvania Synod has adopted the Augsburg Confession only conditionally; second, it ignores the other symbolical books, except Luther's Smaller Catechism. On this point Dr. Krauth testifies that they are antagonistic, Dr. Schæffer says the same, and Dr. Schmucker. The understanding of this antagonism by these witnesses, though expressed in different words, is substantially the same. Dr. Schmucker says the Ministerium is antagonistic to the doctrinal position and some usages which obtain in the Synod of East Pennsylvania, and has been ever since the existence of the Synod of East Pennsylvania; that

it is antagonistic to the whole position of the East Pennsylvania Synod with relation to the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church; and these Confessions are the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, the Apology of the Confession; the two Catechisms of Luther, the Smalcald Articles, and the Formula of Concord; that the Synod of East Pennsylvania requires only a conditional obligation to the Augsburg Confession; the Synod of East Pennsylvania requires the acceptance of the teachings of the Augsburg Confession only with reference to the doctrines fundamental to Christianity, while the Ministerium of Pennsylvania requires the acceptance of all the doctrines of said Confession; the Synod of East Pennsylvania, therefore, allows liberty of reception or rejection of the doctrines contained in said Confession, not fundamental to the common faith of the Christian Church. Dr. Schæffer says that the Ministerium presents as its confession of faith the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church; the East Pennsylvania Synod professes the Augsburg Confession, and practically ignores the rest. This may be considered a fair summary of the complainants evidence on this point.

On the other side we have the testimony of Dr. Brown. He says the Synod of East Pennsylvania is not antagonistic to the Ministerium, only as the Ministerium has placed itself in antagonism to the Synod of East Pennsylvania; that large portions of the Lutheran Church have never adopted all the Symbolical Books; a large part of the Synods in the United States never have; such adoption has never been regarded by the Lutheran Church, as a whole, as a test of Lutheranism, but the Augsburg Confession alone has been universally recognized as the test of orthodox Lutheranism. The Church is known, historically, in some countries simply as the Church of the Augsburg Confession. Again he says: The General Synod and Synod of East Pennsylvania are Evangelical Lutheran bodies. Dr. Hay says, they are Evangelical Lutheran bodies; there is no spirit of antagonism, as far as he knows, on the part of the East Pennsylvania Synod. Mr. Mennig

says, the East Pennsylvania Synod is independent of, but not antagonistic to the Ministerium, as far as he knows.

Besides this testimony, bearing directly on this question, there are pages by the same witnesses on numerous doctrinal points intended to establish or refute the alleged antagonism, which I do not think it necessary to refer to here.

As before stated, to support the bill in this case, the difference in doctrine on these points must be radical; that is, the doctrines of the East Pennsylvania Synod must be so completely at variance with the doctrines of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, that, if adhered to by St. Paul's congregation, the trust created by Mary Livingston's deed would be defeated. Let us see exactly what position the Ministerium and the Synod of East Pennsylvania occupy in this particular. It will be remembered that when the Synod of East Pennsylvania was formed, it adopted the constitution of the General Synod. This was in force in 1853, when the Ministerium renewed its connection with the General Synod. In 1864 an Amendment to article 3, Section 3, of the constitution of the General Synod was proposed, and afterwards adopted. This amendment speaks of the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that word." This proposed amendment, and the preamble and resolutions relative to the Augsburg Confession, were the action of the General Synod which so effectually pacified the Ministerium of Pennsylvania after its delegates at York withdrew in 1864, and of which it subsequently spoke as "conservative churchly action." They will be found on pp. 39 and 40 of the Minutes of the General Synod for 1864. The same words as quoted above are found in the amended constitution of the General Synod, adopted 1869, Article 2, Section 3, and that declaration is still in force. The Synod of East Pennsylvania, as a member of the General Synod, adopted this amendment, and has always adhered to it. In the latest declaration of its doctrinal basis it says, that, in adopting the amendments to the constitution of the General Synod, it has "planted itself fully upon the Augsburg Confession as its doc-

trinal basis." It also incorporated in its constitution the resolution of General Synod in 1864, on the subject of the Augsburg Confession. This constitution of the East Pennsylvania Synod is appended to their minutes for 1873, and the doctrinal basis of the Synod appears on p. 77. This is the position of the East Pennsylvania Synod and of the respondents as to the Augsburg Confession.

The Ministerium of Pennsylvania, by its Constitution of 1867, Chapter 2, § 11, presents this Confession of faith, "that the Unaltered Augsburg Confession is, in all its parts, in harmony with the Rule of Faith, and is a correct exhibition of doctrine; and that the Apology, the two Catechisms of Luther, the Smalcald Articles, and the Formula of Concord, are a faithful development and defence of the doctrines of the Word of God and of the Augsburg Confession."

"All questions concerning the faith of the Church, and the administration of the Sacraments, shall be decided in accordance with this rule, and with these Confessions."

In 1853, the Ministerium passed a series of resolutions relative to these Confessions, found on p. 32 of its minutes for that year. In these they "acknowledge the collective body of the Symbolical Books, as the historico-confessional writings of the Evangelical Lutheran Church," and accord special importance to the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Smaller Catechism. This is not an unqualified acknowledgment such as is the quotation just given from the Constitution of 1867. In fact to acknowledge the Symbolical Books as the "historico-confessional writings" is to give them a very long name which may imply that they are to be subscribed to in full, and may not. I do not know what a "historico-confessional writing" is, except it be a writing which contains a history of the Confession.

This position, taken in the Constitution of 1867, is the one now occupied by the Ministerium and the complainants. They insist that it is the rule of faith to which all Lutherans must subscribe.

There is one insuperable objection to adopting their views. It is this: Never before the Constitution of 1867, in the his-

tory of the Lutheran Church in the United States do we find such a standard set up. To say that this is the standard of Evangelical Lutheranism, is to brand as un-Lutheran all those who before that time had supposed that they were Lutherans, and among them are found the names of many whom the Ministerium to-day delights to call the fathers of the Church —as well as to unchurch those who at the present time have not accepted this basis. Can it be possible that the correct basis of the Lutheran faith was unknown in America until brought to light in the Constitution of 1867? Did the learned and pious fathers live and die under a delusion that they were Lutherans, whereas they were not? Indeed, if this rule was carried out, the Ministerium would blot out its own history as a Lutheran body preceding 1867; for up to that time no such standard is found in its own records, so far as the evidence in this case shows. True, on p. 124 of Plffs. Appendix, is an extract from the North American Ministerial, Ordnung of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, adopted June 12th, 1781, and therein appears these words: "in doctrine and life each minister approves himself in accordance with the word of God and our Symbolical Books." By this it would scarcely appear that the Augsburg Confession and other Symbolical Books are allotted the same importance they receive in the constitution of 1867. Certain it is that in later years, when the General Synod was formed (1820), no such standard prevailed; and in 1823, when the Ministerium left the General Synod, it was not because of the want of such a standard. For the next 30 years, the Ministerium stood by itself, and there is no evidence to show that during that time any thing like the constitution of 1867 prevailed in that body. In 1853, the Ministerium again joined the General Synod holding then the same doctrines now pronounced un-Lutheran by the Ministerium. Its connection with that body continued for eleven years, and when, in 1864, dissension broke out, it was at once assuaged by the amendment and resolution of the General Synod in that year, as shown so clearly by the pamphlet before referred to, relative to the proceedings at Ft. Wayne, in 1866. Is it consistent for the

Ministerium to subscribe to certain Lutheran doctrines in 1864, forsake them in 1866, adopt new ones in 1867, and then turn round and say that those who remained faithful to the doctrines of 1864 are not Lutherans? Yet, that is what the Court must countenance, if a decree is made in favor of the complainants in this bill.

There are pages of testimony in this case on the Real Presence, transubstantiation, consubstantiation, the mass, the sacraments, confession and absolution, &c., all of which are embraced in the Augsburg Confession, and have been much discussed since; which testimony I do not propose to dwell upon. Its object was to show a doctrinal difference on these points. I have examined it all with care, and find that there is no substantial difference. Section 1 of the doctrinal basis of the East Pennsylvania Synod (p. 77 minutes of 1873) is an excellent summary of the views of complainants' witnesses on these points. There was a great battle of words over the Real Presence, and on this question was more delicate hair-splitting than on any other. The truth is, neither party believes Christ is physically present in the elements so as to be the subject of physical mastication. Both believe he is really present; and it is when they attempt to tell you what they mean by "really present" that the trouble begins. One says, there is a sacramental presence of the body and the blood in the bread and wine, and a sacramental union; another says, Christ is present in his glorified body. One thing is settled, the presence of Christ in the elements is a mystery beyond the reach of the finite understanding; and the human mind always runs into desperate confusion when it attempts to solve the infinite. If there is any difference on this point it is only in explaining a proposition which both parties admit, and the difference is so faint and immaterial, that the Court could not for that reason say one party was not Lutheran, and disturb their title to real estate in consequence.

The alleged ignoring of the other Symbolical Books can not be fatal to respondents, if certain testimony offered by complainants is to be believed. Dr. Schæffer says they

had not been so particularly enumerated before 1867, though understood in the general phrase, Symbolical Books; he believes they were mentioned in a general way in the Evangelical Lutheran Confession of Faith, but not so particularly. He is not able to say they were ever mentioned or referred to in any liturgy used in the Ministerium before the last one (1855). The Augsburg Confession and the Smaller Catechism are the only books which have been universally acknowledged in the Lutheran Church. A portion in Europe, and it may be a large portion in this country have not acknowledged them. (See also Mr. Brobst, p. 89.) He is corroborated in these facts as follows: Dr. C. P. Krauth (also a witness) at p. 400 of the July number of the Evangelical Quarterly Review, 1867, (the same year the Constitution of the Ministerium was adopted) speaks of the Augsburg Confession as "the only distinctive Symbol universally recognized in the Lutheran Church." The same learned authority in the American Cyclopædia, vol. 10, p. 731, topic "Lutheran Church," says, "In the three general Creeds and in the Unaltered Augsburg Confession (1530) the Lutheran Church has a bond of distinctive life throughout the entire world." Speaking of the other Symbolical Books as "a further development of her doctrines," the confessional character of which is recognized by the larger portion of the Church. Further on we find this, "In the United States the doctrinal test has varied in strictness in different Synods." Besides, we have the positive testimony, on behalf of the respondents, of Dr. Baum, Dr. Brown, Dr. Hay, to the same effect.

It is also a historical fact that when first promulgated, the Symbolical Books were not adopted as indispensable by a considerable portion of the Lutheran Church in Europe. Many authorities might be cited to show this; but it would seem that the evidence already dwelt upon is sufficient to warrant this conclusion, that in its position relative to the Augsburg Confession and the other Symbolical Books, the Synod of East Pennsylvania conforms to all the requirements of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

7. Under the bill, paragraph 10, the general answer, paragraph 10, and Mr. Mennig's answer, paragraph 6, I find that the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of East Pennsylvania was duly incorporated as a body politic by an Act of the General Assemby of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, passed the 11th day of February, A. D. 1847. See Pamphlet Laws, 1847, p. 122.

The allegation in the latter part of this paragraph of the bill, that by this Act of Incorporation the usages, principles and doctrines of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, as expressed in its Symbolical Books and more especially set forth in the Unaltered Augsburg Confession of Faith and Luther's Smaller Catechism, and as practiced and acknowledged by the said German Evangelical Lutheran Congregation of the City of Allentown, are wholly abandoned and repudiated cannot be accepted as fact.

An examination of the Act will show that it is wholly silent as to usages, principles and doctrines. It, like the Charter of the Ministerium, was intended to secure secular interests, nothing else. This paragraph of the bill is absurd on its face. Its simple meaning is this: An Evangelical Lutheran Synod was incorporated by an Act of Assembly, which Act wholly abandoned and repudiated the princples and doctrines of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

This and the 7th and 8th paragraphs, taken together, attribute a curious course of conduct to the Legislature.. The 7th and 8th paragraphs tell us that an Evangelical Lutheran Synod was incorporated by an Act of Assembly, which enjoined and commanded the observance of the doctrines and principles of the Evangelical Lutheran Church; while in the 10th we learn of another Evangelical Lutheran Synod, situated in the same territory, being incorporated by an Act which wholly repudiates and abandons the same doctrines and principles. Before the Court accepts this interpretation, the repudiation and abandonment must be most distinctly stated. Surely it could not have been the intention of the Legislature thus to tear the Evangelical Lutheran Church into fragments.

8. Under the bill, paragraph 11, the general answer, paragraph 11, I do not find the facts as alleged by complainants.

I understand by the usages herein ascribed to the Synod of East Pennsylvania simply New Measures. The only official action of the Synod on this subject, so far as known to the Master, is found in the minutes for 1843, pp. 12—14, where they state what they do, and what they do not, approve of. Their approval covers nothing subversive of the Lutheran faith, and their disapproval of disorder, irregularity and extravagance, is emphatic. There is no doubt that the Synod of East Pennsylvania heartily approves of what are known as revivals of religion, and rejoice to hear of them in the congregations under its care. This subject will, however, come up under the discussion of New Measures in St. Paul's Congregation, and may be dropped for the present.

The Synod of East Pennsylvania has not shown a disposition to adopt principles and doctrines fundamentally and practically opposed to those of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. In one marked instance its course was distinctly opposite. What is known as the "Definite Synodical Platform" once created a considerable stir in Lutheran circles. It appeared in 1855. It affected the doctrines of the Lutheran Church, and may be regarded as an extreme development of the idea that the Symbolical Books are not binding in all they say. It was at once vigorously attacked. (See "The Broken Platform," by Rev. John H. Hoffman, and "A Plea for the Augsburg Confession," by Rev. W. J. Mann.) It also seems to have found some support, as it was adopted by a number of Synods, and defended by Dr. S. S. Schmucker in a book called "Lutheran Symbols." The Synod of East Pennsylvania, however, instead of adopting it, promptly and decidedly expressed their "most unqualified disapprobation of this most dangerous attempt to change the doctrinal basis, and revolutionize the existing character of the Lutheran churches now united in the General Synod." (See Minutes of East Pennsylvania Synod, 1854, pp. 13, 14.

9. The 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th and 17th paragraphs of the bill, the same numbered paragraphs of the general an-

swer, and 7th, 8th and 9th paragraphs of Mr. Mennig's answer, relates to the same subject matter, New Measures in St. Paul's congregation, and what has been done in consequence thereof. They will be treated together.

Much as has been said about this subject in the Lutheran Church, New Measures is an indefinite term, one of reproach applied to a certain line of effort to convert, or awaken and save sinners. Rev. Julius Ehrhart says, it means the anxious bench, protracted meetings, shouting and other disorderly conduct throughout the services; they have for their object the effectual conversion of sinners. Rev. S. K. Brobst says, New Measures are defined to be a new mode of converting sinners to God, that is, new means of which nothing was known or practiced in the former days, and of which our Confessions know nothing; that the Synod has defined them partly in the resolutions passed at Easton, in 1871, (see Minutes for that year, pp. 27, 28), and more fully in an official letter by Dr. Schæffer approved by Synod in 1872, that a committee was appointed by the Ministerium to consider and report what were New Measures, but that committee never reported. Dr. Schmucker does not define them, but tells wherein they differ from the doctrines and usages of the Church. Rev. Mr. Rath means by New Measures strange teachings and practices that are introduced in some Lutheran congregations as effectual means to convert sinners, of which the fathers in our Church knew nothing. Dr. Schæffer says, he means by the system of New Measures a system which practically sets up certain peculiar emotions and feelings and experiences awakened in the heart and mind as the ground of the sinners faith, and the witness or evidence of his conversion. Dr. Krauth does not give a definition; but their points of difference from Lutheran doctrines and usages as received by the Ministerium.

On the part of the respondents, Mr. Mennig says, he never heard of anything defined as New Measures in the Lutheran Church, except Dr. Schæffer's letter. He says, by Measures he means the outward forms observed in meetings for the

worship of God. Dr. Brown says the term is of frequent occurrence in Lutheran and some other Churches; it has no very definite meaning, that is, it is not a well defined term, and is used by different persons in very different senses; can hardly say he knows of a system by that name; there are practices frequently called by that name, as protracted meetings, or continuous preaching, or religious services day after day, or evening after evening; it is a very wide indefinite term; sometimes applied to prayer-meetings when they become noisy. He says the term is used with great latitude; he would mean by it any material departure from the ordinary means employed in the churches. Dr. Hay says the term, a New Measure man, as used among ministers of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, means a Lutheran minister who faithfully and zealously administers the divinely appointed means of grace, and is always on the alert to embrace every suitable opportunity of winning souls to Christ and edifying believers, by the use of any means not unscriptural or injudicious. New Measures is a term usually applied to the various methods employed in our Church for the purpose of promoting the growth of vital piety among our people; it is a means of conversion.

Plaintiffs' Exhibit U is the only part of the documentary evidence giving a definition of New Measures. Mr. Brobst refers to this in his testimony, as "an official letter by Dr. Schæffer which was approved as correct in its definition by Synod in Philadelphia in 1872." In this they seem to be mistaken. This exhibit is dated August 14th, 1872; Synod met that year on Sunday, the 26th of May, and on the next Thursday, May 30th, 1872, the resolutions on the subject were passed. (See Minutes for that year, p. 26.) The correspondence therein referred to could not have included Plaintiffs' exhibit U, as it was not written till nearly three months afterwards. It would seem quite probable that the correspondence referred to in the proceedings of Synod for 1872 is found in Plaintiffs' exhibit N. The dates of letters and their contents both favor this idea. The resolutions of Synod at Easton, in 1871, also referred to by Mr. Brobst, are not a sat-

isfactory definition. The one covering this point is as follows: "*Resolved*, That the system of New Measures is in the judgment of this Synod not in accordance with the word of God, in that it degrades the divinely appointed means of grace, gives undue importance to mere inventions of men, impairs the great truth of Justification by Faith in Christ, and tends to produce a diseased form of Christian life." We conclude, therefore, that the Ministerium of Pennsylvania never did define New Measures, and that the letter of Dr. Schæffer is to be regarded only as expressive of the views of an individual, not of the Ministerium.

There is no complaint of the exercises on Sunday morning or Sunday evening, nor of the regular weekly meetings held on Tuesday or Wednesday evening. These, the complainants admit, were always proper, and, we are warranted in believing, entirely Lutheran. Only in one instance is any fault found in this case with Mr. Mennig's preaching, that is by Rev. Mr. Brobst. He speaks of his preaching the terrors of the Law instead of the love of the Gospel, and he describes the system of preaching by revivalists, saying distinctly that, "Mr. Mennig pursued that system not at all times, but during his protracted meetings." He makes it quite clear that no fault was found with the Sunday morning and evening exercises; what trifling difference there was, he says, did not conflict with the Augsburg Confession. There is a further explanation of what he had said in chief about exciting the emotions. Rev. Mr. Rath says, "No charge was ever made against Rev. Mennig for not conforming to the liturgy in his Sunday services; the charges against him related especially to these protracted meetings and New Measures; the charges related exclusively to the New Measures so-called." To the same effect, see Reuben Sheirer, p. 13. Mr. Maddern says, "Saw no difference in the Sunday morning and evening services; * * during the forty years I was a member, up to my suspension, the Sunday A. M. and P. M. services were the same; the only services I objected to were the protracted meetings for two or three weeks." See also Jonathan Reichard, p. 33; Samuel Sell, p. 46; William Johnson, p. 56.

On p. 21 Dfts. notes, Mr. Mennig describes the Sunday morning and evening services.

See also Plaintiffs' exhibit Z. In Plaintiffs' exhibit T are the charges submitted to conference, in 1870, against Mr. Mennig and the Vestry. In the 4th specification against Mr. Mennig, he is charged with preaching the Gospel differently, and with preaching a different Gospel, especially with reference to conversion. Nowhere, however, is there any complaint about any irregularity or un-Lutheran feature in the Sunday morning and evening services. The whole difficulty lay in the protracted meetings held during the first weeks of the month of January, of that year.

This discloses a peculiar feature of this case. Mr. Mennig has served this congregation as pastor since 1859; and during all that time not a word of fault is found with the chief exercises of the sanctuary. He has during this period preached 104 sermons and 52 Wednesday evening lectures, each year, which are Lutheran in form, doctrine, and substance. He has also held protracted meetings in the winter season, the length of which varied according to circumstances. We shall see further on that they did not average over three weeks. At the rate of six meetings a week, this would give 18 for each year. These, it is alleged, are un-Lutheran; and therefore the Court is asked to say the respondents have made a radical change of faith and doctrine, for which they must surrender the property held by them in trust. But is this wholly equitable? Suppose the 18 exercises are radically un-Lutheran, what is to be done with the 150 exercises which are radically Lutheran? Shall they be lost sight of? This seems on its face a very dry and arithmetical way to treat of doctrinal matters; yet it is not out of place, where a bill charges the respondents in the broadest, most general terms, with no longer believing and practicing the usages, principles and doctrines of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, with wholly abandoning and repudiating its principles, with being in fundamental and practical opposition to those principles.

Now, what has been done in St. Paul's church which comes

under this term New Measures? First, they have held during the winter season what are known as protracted or revival meetings for the awakening and conversion of sinners. Meetings of this kind were not held before Mr. Mennig became pastor. Mr. Brobst, in 1873, testifies that the New Measure system was introduced about fifteen years ago. That would carry us back to 1858. Mr. Mennig says, that in the winter of 1859—60 the Lord revived his work among them, and they had a continued meeting of several weeks, and from that time on he thinks they had such a special meeting every year. From this it would seem that the holding of these meetings began in 1859, and they have been held in each year since. Mr. Sell says, these meetings were sometimes twice a week, sometimes lasted for several weeks. Mr. Sheirer says, they continued one, two, or three weeks, every evening. Mr. Johnson says they were once held nearly three weeks, and he was there nearly every night. Mr. Brobst speaks of their being continued for several successive weeks every evening. Mr. Mennig speaks of their being continued for two, three, sometimes four weeks every evening. Mr. Anewalt says they were held for two or three weeks, not for four weeks during his eight or ten years knowledge of them. We may conclude that these meetings were kept up generally for two or three weeks, in each year; that in a few instances they may have continued four weeks.

Second. What was the character of these meetings? What was done there? *a.* They did not have the anxious bench. Reuben Sheirer says, he (Mr. Mennig) asked them to come up to the front pews, to kneel down, or if they did not like to do that, to kneel at their places, or seats; then he came down from the pulpit, and went to those persons who knelt down at the various places, while the congregation were singing, and spoke to them in whispers. Mr. Sterner says they were requested to come forward, or to remain in their seats, but they were to show themselves if they wanted any one to pray for them. Mr. Reichard says there was no anxious bench in that church to his knowledge. Mrs. Mary Eisenhard attended these protracted meetings, in 1872, in quest of information, as

she wanted to join the church. She says she "saw nothing in particular of the anxious bench; only heard Mr. Mennig ask them to come, not to come forward." Judging from her animated description, the New Measures were at their height when she was present, and if the anxious bench was used at all, it would have been on such occasions. Mr. Johnson says he called them up to become converted in their prayer meetings; "he did not call them forward, but he called them up in the time I was there." Mr. Brobst says, Mr. Mennig called out those concerned for their souls salvation to the front bench, or went to them himself at their seats. "Mr. Mennig told them to manifest their desire to be prayed for by either coming to one of the front seats, or kneeling down where they were sitting." This he saw perhaps a dozen times, especially eight or ten years ago. In the defendants' notes Mr. Mennig says "those awakened persons were privileged, if they had any desire for the prayers of the congregation in their behalf, either to make it known in their seats by rising or kneeling down, or by taking the front pews." He speaks of those awakened "making use of the privilege extended them, by coming in the front pews, or by rising or kneeling down in their seats; while they were in the front pews they were instructed, questions were asked them, and they were prayed for; sometimes there was no singing during this time, sometimes there was; at times some voices were heard saying "Amen," or "God grant it," in response to the person leading in prayer; different members of the church led in prayer, when these people came forward. Again he says he never had, or used, an anxious bench in St. Paul's; that he never used the words "anxious bench," "mourner's bench," or any words like them in reference to these prayer meetings. Mr. Anewalt says: "Mr. Mennig would exhort such as felt their sins, to repent, and show themselves, if they wished the prayers of the congregation, either by coming forward in the front pews, or remain kneeling in their own seats; they were singing and praying while this was going on. In plaintiffs' exhibit T, containing the charges made at South Easton, the complaint on this point is thus set out: The pastor ex-

horts the people to come to a front seat, or to remain upon their knees in their pews. The pastor and others too then go and speak to them, the congregation in the meanwhile singing hymns." From this it seems that Mr. Mennig, in order to ascertain who of the audience were under conviction, and desired the prayers of the church in their behalf, asked them to manifest it either by coming to the front pews, or rising from their seats. The sole object in view was to learn what, if any, sinners were giving serious attention to their spiritual welfare. The object certainly was a good one, and cannot be considered subversive of Lutheranism. It will be observed that in no instance was the taking of the front pews insisted on. Inquirers always had the choice to make their wish known in any one of several ways. Mr. Mennig's only wish was to learn who would accept counsel from him. How he obtained this information was a matter of little or no moment, whether they called at his house, or rose from their seats, knelt at their pews, or came to the front pew. It is to be regretted that the evidence does not inform us just what the anxious bench is. The term is imported from other denominations, which in their protracted meetings resort to most questionable means of inducing people to join the church. As soon as any individual in the audience is found to be thoughtful on the subject of religion, he is led to what is known as the anxious bench, a seat set apart to that use, made accessible in many instances from all sides. This and its occupants are surrounded by earnest but extravagant men, and sometimes women, who bend all their energies in exciting to the highest possible pitch the fear, the anxiety, the joy, or the sorrow, in fact any emotion to which they themselves or the inquiring sinners are susceptible. Wild scenes sometimes follow these efforts. Some become "happy," others fall rigid to the floor, still others have something similar to convulsions more becoming to the mad-house than the meeting-house, and jump, and kick, and strike about wildly. The object of all this is in no instance intelligent conviction of sin, but excitement of the emptiest description. How different, in every respect, from the aim of Mr. Mennig. In order that he might

reach sinners willing to take counsel from him, he asked them to make themselves known in almost any way, it mattered not what. Then he went to them and talked and prayed with them, well knowing that personal solicitation is one of the most efficient means of turning men away from error. Given a sinner open to conviction, a saint yearning to save his soul, and an interview between them; the salvation of the sinner is almost sure to follow.

b. These prayer meetings were conducted in good order. There was at times disorder, but to say that disorder reigned there, would not be correct. On this point the evidence is so voluminous that I shall not attempt even to condense it; but will refer the Court to it by page, and state what facts I believe to be established. See Reuben Sheirer, Absalom Sterner, Wm. Maddern, Samuel Colver, Samuel Sell, Mrs. Mary Eisenhardt, Wm. Johnson, Alfred Grim, Mr. Brobst, Mr. Mennig, and Mr. Anewalt. It will be observed that some of the worst accounts of these meetings given by witnesses for the complainants are greatly modified by other parts of their testimony. Mr. Sheirer was formerly a leader in them and attended them regularly, until he had a quarrel with Mr. Mennig about a board-bill, in settling which Mr. Mennig insisted on deducting $10. From that time the meetings were too loud for Mr. Sheirer, and he ceased attending. This was in 1868 or 1869. Since then he knows nothing of them personally. Mr. Sterner's attendance was so limited that he can scarcely say what was their general character. He tells us they sometimes held these meetings a whole week, but he never attended a whole week. Again, he says during the last few years he was a member, he did not take sacrament, and only went to church and prayer meetings occasionally. Mr. Sterner's habits, as a church member, were quite unbecoming, in one zealous for the good order of prayer meetings, and his connection with the church was involuntarily terminated in the fall of 1870. Mr. Maddern says, he attended regularly until about five or six years back, *i. e.* till about 1868. These meetings being so offensive to him as to stop his going to church, it is reasonable to suppose that his attendance upon

them also terminated at the same time. There is nothing in his testimony to show that he attended later. His observations while he did go seem to have been close, and he tells us he was often present. No doubt the two instances of disorder given by him are truthful. Mr. Sell says he did not attend these meetings regularly at any time since Mennig was there; he did not go often; sometimes twice a week, sometimes not for several weeks. Mrs. Mary Eisenhardt attended three times in all. Mr. Johnson did not attend the protracted meetings every year; once they were held nearly three weeks, and he was there nearly every night. His testimony was taken in July, 1873, and he says he attended them regularly the last years; before he did not, because he could not leave his business. Mr. Brobst says, "during the last few years I seldom attended the church, and cannot say whether they (the noise and confusion) increased or diminished. I was in the church sometimes, but I did not attend these meetings; I did not attend them regularly, because I did not like them, but attended a number of times.

Mr. Mennig was present most of the time. This is not questioned; and he himself says, "I was happy to be blessed with good health and have control almost during the entire time." Now it is distinctly proven by some of complainants' witnesses that, when Mr. Mennig was there, good order was maintained. As to this see Mr. Brobst's distinct testimony. See also Alfred Grim. Others, as Wm. Johnson, Mrs. Mary Eisenhardt and Mr. Sell say, that there was noise and disorder in Mr. Mennig's presence. Mr. Mennig swears positively to his suppression of disorderly manifestations. Of all the complainants' witnesses on this point none was better qualified to speak than Mr. Brobst. His attendance, though not regular, was quite frequent, he is an accurate observer, and extremely careful in testifying to be exact. In view of the fact that he and others of complainants' witnesses agree with Mr. Mennig and Mr. Anewalt, as to Mr. Mennig's uniform effort to preserve order, I think it may be safely inferred as a fact, that when Mr. Mennig was present, noise and confu-

sion were prevented. Occasionally, no doubt there was noise. Mr. Mennig himself admits it, giving one instance, where he stopped in the midst of a prayer to suppress noise. Persons at times in great joy would call out, others under conviction would mourn audibly. But to say that these things prevailed to such an extent as to stamp the meetings held by Mr. Mennig as rude, disorderly gatherings, would be going further than the evidence justifies.

When Mr. Mennig was absent, others had charge of the meetings, and there was greater license. At times extravagant conduct, shouting, stamping of feet, clapping of hands prevailed. The evidence, however, does not show that this was always the case, and it must be borne in mind, that Mr. Mennig was absent only a small portion of the time. Every instance of disorder detailed in the proof could be assigned to the series of meetings held during one winter, and then the majority of meetings be free from disturbance. And remember, that when this bill was filed, Mr. Mennig had been holding these meetings for fourteen or fifteen years. Would it be just to infer from the limited amount of disorder shown in this case, that all these meetings have been of that character? It would surely seem not.

By referring to p. 61 of Plffs. Appendix, will be found in Dr. Schæffer's letter of definition, four specifications of what are not New Measures; and on pp. 62 and 63, three specifications of what are. I am convinced that all the performances at Mr. Mennig's revival meetings, with few exceptions, could be included under the four heads on p. 61; while those on pp. 62 and 63 would cover the irregularities which broke out now and then, but were not of such frequent occurrence that the character of the meetings should be judged by them.

These revival or protracted meetings are not contrary to the usages, principles, and doctrines of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Such measures are not new. It can be abundantly shown, that meetings closely similar in character were held in Europe in what is known as the Pietistic movement among Lutherans, headed by Spener. It would be idle to attempt to show that those taking part in this movement

were Lutherans; they never were spoken of as anything else. This kind of meetings was introduced in 1670. At that time they were a "decided innovation." But having continued among Lutherans from that date to this, can the Court now call them a New Measure among Lutherans? The Pietistic movement resulted in the establishment of the University of Halle in 1694, and became at once the nursery of what may be called liberal Lutheranism, in contradistinction from the more rigid type cultivated at Wittenberg. What is of most interest in this case is, that the founders of Lutheranism in America came not from Wittenberg, but from Halle. Muhlenberg was of that school, so also Helmuth, Handschuh, Brunholtz, Heintzelman, Kunze, Schmidt and others. And missionary reports from America were sent back to Halle and published under the name of "Die Hallische Nachrichten."

The trust in this case was created Nov. 3, 1813. The prevailing sentiment of the Lutheran Church in America and especially of the Pennsylvania Synod, on the subject of revivals of religion, at that time is important. That it was favorable, is shown by the following translation from "The Evangelical Magazine of the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod," for the months of April, May and June, 1814, but a few months after the date of Mary Livingston's deed. The extract is from pp. 136, 137. After speaking of the works of Spener and Franke in Germany, and their followers in this country, it says, "In no church or party is repentance, a change of mind (sinnes-ænderung, conversion), living faith in the atonement of Jesus Christ, sanctification, and practical Christianity probably more insisted on, than is now done by many Lutheran preachers. And much living Christianity has also, on the whole, been established among them; but one thing is still lacking—a revival that should penetrate the whole mass, that should bring forth a general laying hold of the spirit, out of which life in all the parts, reformation of morals and better Evangelical church discipline might arise. All this by the grace of God could be done in all the denominations of the Germans, if the preachers see to it that the door to the sheepfold of Jesus is opened to none but con-

verted men; if the church council of every congregation support their teachers in church discipline; if the awakened (converted) and children of God in every congregation establish private meetings for edification among themselves, in order to strengthen and encourage one another by means of singing, reading of the Scriptures and prayer, on their pilgrimage to eternity. Prayer meetings have often been decried by vicious men and thoughtless preachers. I shall, however, defend them, as long as I retain a good conscience, if they are conducted in proper order. These useful and necessary exercises originated with the pious Spener, and are the most appropriate means of uniting the awakened (converted) and retaining them in good cheer. * * That preacher who neither establishes these nor any other arrangements in his congregations, in order to edify seeking souls, and promote them in grace, must have ease, money and the favor of man as the object of his labors. Such indolence is contrary to the purpose of God and the design of his office." If this is the Lutheranism to be encouraged by the conveyance of Mary Livingston, which party to this controversy, the complainants or respondents, is following it the more closely?

Without dwelling upon it at length, the evidence shows that in numerous instances such meetings have been conducted in congregations of the Ministerium. Ministers, members of that body have encouraged and practiced these New Measures, if they be new; and in no instance has any one been disciplined for so doing, or his Lutheranism called in question.

One case has been decided by our Supreme Court which controls the present one, so far as the New Measure issue is concerned. In this particular, the issue there was the same as here. It is the case of Keller et al. vs. Weaver et al. The decision of the Judge was very emphatic in favor of the respondents or New Measure party, and on appeal, it was affirmed by the Supreme Court, without comment, they "being entirely satisfied with the conclusions of the learned Judge in the Court below." I do not know that the case is reported.

It is No. 8, May T., 1865, and a certified copy of the opinion was submitted.

But say the complainants, these revival meetings and New Measures have been decided by the Ministerium of Pennsylvania to be "not in accordance with the word of God—clearly contrary to the Spirit of Lutheranism, utterly at variance with the character and interests of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and are opposed to the uniform practice of the German Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and adjacent States," see the bill paragraph 12. Part of the question in this paragraph comes from a resolution of the Ministerium in 1871; see minutes for that year, p. 27; another part from an expression of judgment, not a decision or resolution, to be found in the minutes for 1872, p. 26; while the words "utterly at variance with the character and interests of the Lutheran Church," are not found in the action of the Ministerium at all, but in the President's report in 1871; see minutes for that year, p. 9. It is submitted, that whatever is to be binding in a case involving such large property interests as the present, and in which the question of fidelity in the administration of a trust is raised, must be at least a solemn adjudication, a "deliverance after deliberation," on the part of this ecclesiastical tribunal, and regular. The Courts of law will not compel the respondents to surrender their title to real estate because the President in a certain report said so and so, and the Ministerium once expressed an opinion in such and such words. A very marked difference is noticeable between the doings of the Ministerium in the minutes for 1871, pp. 27 and 28, and those in the minutes for 1872, p. 26. In the former instance the body takes action, resolves that New Measures are thus and so; then follow three resolutions in which the Synod "enjoins" the congregation. This is clearly intended to be a fixed rule of conduct, obligatory on all interested. But the action of 1872 presents no such features. It does not command or enjoin anything. An opinion is expressed, advice is given, with which parties might or might not comply, as their own conveniences directed. This view I believe to be correct. Its effect is to limit the consid-

eration of the action of the Ministerium as a decision in this case to the resolutions of 1871, and in them a very curious feature appears. They do not anywhere denounce the New Measures as un-Lutheran, or as opposed to the uniform practice of the Ministerium. This is not done till the following year, 1872.

I propose, however, to examine the proceedings of Conference and Synod, as they are relied upon in the fourteenth paragraph of the bill, and see what weight they carry with them.

Mr. Mennig had been laboring in this Congregation for ten years, when, in 1869, the disturbances first broke out. The Church had prospered, as shown by the record of communicants, and this very year, 1869, witnessed its greatest thrift. Even then, after ten years of revival meetings, the complaint first sent to conference told no tale of New Measures. It asked for redress solely on account of the action of the election officers at the Easter election for vestrymen, 1869. The votes of the memorialists had been rejected, whereby they felt they had been "slighted and deeply injured." Immediately after the election, the worsted party presented their respectful but decided protest against the recognition of the successful candidates as properly elected officers of the church. Conference did not act at once, but appointed a committee to investigate. Up to this time, New Measures were unheard of. When this committee sat, the memorialists presented to them not only Plaintiffs' Exhibit X, but also a new document, Plaintiffs' Exhibit Z, and in this is found the first mention of offensive usages and revival meetings. Notwithstanding the protest of the church council, the committee investigated both that for which they had authority, and that for which they had not. The church council declared they were not prepared to reply to this new indictment, in Plaintiffs's Exhibit Z, and that it was irrelevant to the original charge. Thereupon the committee prayed and went home. The momentous contents of Plaintiffs' Exhibit Z stunned the committee into an apprehension of the entire subversion of Lutheranism in that church; and they reported accordingly to

a special meeting of Conference at Reading, May 22, 1869. Here the charge of offensive usages and revival meetings was presented to Conference itself in Plaintiffs' Exhibit V, a duplicate of Plaintiffs' Exhibit Z, with additional names. Plaintiffs' Exhibit V closes with a prayer for advice and aid. Conference thereupon passed the resolution found in Plaintiffs' Appendix, referring the written charges to Synod, and postponing action on the other troubles to another special meeting. Synod met on the day following, May 23, in the same place, Reading. But the charges referred to it were not presented; why not is unexplained. (See Report of Committee on Conferences, Minutes of Ministerium, 1869, p. 31). Conference, however, proceeded at another special meeting, at which Defendants' Exhibit F was presented in reply to Plaintiffs' Exhibit V, held June 23d, 1869, at Allentown, and resolved that the Easter Monday election, 1869, was null and void. They also passed upon the accusation which they had referred previously to Synod. Their action on this point is in general terms, of which the most explicit is this, "we, nevertheless, *cannot* recognize the protracted meetings and prayer meetings, as they are held here, as agreeing with the usages of the Lutheran Church." These proceedings were transmitted to the vestry in the shape of Defendants' Exhibit G, according to Mr. Anewalt.

The next action of the Conference grew out of the resolutions of vestry of Jan. 1, 1870, from which an appeal was taken (see Defts' Exhibit J). This contains charges against both pastor and vestry, the same in substance as those in Plffs' Exhibit V, but more formal. To these Defts' Exhibit K is a reply. Both were laid before Conference at South Bethlehem, Feb. 15, 1870, when the action found in Plffs' Appendix was taken. This relates only to the charges against the vestry. The charges against the pastor were deferred until the next meeting of Conference. This was the stated meeting at South Easton, Easter week, 1870. Here Conference investigated the charges against Mr. Mennig. The conclusion reached is important. After reciting in the preamble that the introduction of New Measures is in oppo-

sition to the Confession and practice of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and also to the constitution of St. Paul's congregation, Art. 1, Sec. 1, it is resolved:

1. "That pastor Mennig be ordered not only to leave off from all these 'New Measures,' but also to work against them in the congregation with all earnestness, and especially to forbid such persons the exercising of the functions of a pastor in the church, who are not called as teachers in the congregation."

2. "That pastor Mennig publicly in the church read this resolution to the congregation."

Thus Conference passed upon all the charges against both pastor and vestry. Concerning the Easter Monday election, 1869, they came to the conclusion that it "must be declared null and void." Concerning the revival meetings they resolved at Allentown, 1869, that while they heartily encouraged the practice of holding daily prayer meetings at suitable hours in church, so long as they do not conflict with the doctrines and customs of the Lutheran Church, still they could not recognize Mr. Mennig's meetings as agreeing with the usages of the Lutheran Church; and at South Easton, 1870, they passed the two resolutions given above, relative to Mr. Mennig. Mr. Rath speaks of the resolutions as being for final adoption in the case.

Now let us see how this was met by the pastor and vestry. It is an undisputed fact in the case that the vestry complied with the decision of Conference declaring the Easter election, 1869, null and void, to the letter. But the best evidence in the fact that the offices filled at the Easter election, 1869, were thereupon treated as vacant, and at the Easter election, 1870, a double number was elected, to supply both the vacancies regularly occurring that year, and those which had been occupied by the candidates elected in 1869, (see Defts' Exhibit M, which is the tally list of the election of 1870, showing the election of a double number). But the vestry went further; they removed the disabilities which had been enforced and created the dissatisfaction at the election of 1869, and every body was permitted to vote. An examination of the list of

voters in 1870, in Defts' Exhibit M, shows that the greater portion of those who signed Plffs' Exhibit X, Y, and Z voted at the election of 1870.

Mr. Mennig's compliance with the instructions of Conference is shown by his reading the resolutions as ordered by Conference. This is nowhere disputed in the case, and may be taken as an established fact.

This spring and summer of 1870 were the most critical period in the history of the unhappy, and now bitter, controversy. We see the vestry and pastor yielding prompt and full obedience to the decision of Conference. The disaffected members had done away with the election of 1869, and been admitted to free participation in that of 1870. Conference had adopted their views of the revival meetings, and Mr. Mennig had conformed to the instructions of Conference. Thus there was at this time a final adjustment of the difficulties, and nothing but extreme indiscretion overthrew it. A few grains of wisdom and forbearance would then have closed forever the gulf, which to-day is impossible. It is astonishing to find that the body which opened anew this strife was "the Mother Synod," the Ministerium of Pennsylvania. It will be recalled that at the special meeting of Conference, in Reading, May 22, 1869, it resolved to ask Synod for its opinion as a guide. Synod met the very next day, in the same city, yet an examination of its minutes for that year, shows that Conference did not ask its advice. In fact, not a word was communicated on the subject. Before the next meeting of the Ministerium, the Conference had passed on the charges against Mr. Mennig, without the advice of the Ministerium, the vestry and pastor had accepted the decisions, and immediate peace was promised. This was in April, 1870. The Ministerium met in Pottsville, June 12, 1870. Up to this time no protracted meetings had been held. There is not a whisper to show that Mr. Mennig failed in any particular to obey the Conference, or had shown any intention to disobey in the future. He is entitled to the presumption accorded to every man that he intended to obey. How could Con-

ference, in 1870, after acting without the advice of Synod, and laying down for Mr. Mennig a certain course of conduct, thus saying in effect that it could dispose of Mr. Mennig's case without such advice, after its adjudication in the matter had been conformed with, how could Conference in good conscience go to the Ministerium in June, 1870, and revive this discord? And yet this is done. In the Minutes of the Ministerium for 1870, p. 27, will be found the report of the committee on the minutes of conferences, in which they report certain items as claiming the attention of Synod. Of all said there about St. Paul's congregation, not a word is said about the advice, or opinion, which Conference proposed to obtain when it referred the matter to Synod, in 1869. Conference don't ask it: Synod don't give it. What then was the object in bringing this affair before the Ministerium? By referring to the foot note of page 27, it will be seen that the committee on conferences makes no suggestion whatever, but the action of Synod in the matter is coupled with the report of the committee on church difficulties. But, how did St. Paul's affairs get into the hands of that committee? Pages 20 and 21 of the minutes show. A paper signed by some 20 members of the church had been presented complaining of irregularities and New Measures, and asking the assistance of Synod, which they confidently expected would set things right again. Who the signers of this paper were, or what were its contents, is not in evidence. The purport, however, can be pretty confidently inferred, from the fifth resolution, on page 28 of the minutes.

Thus was this controversy first introduced to the Ministerium; and this introduction is of extreme importance, for the Court will see by referring to the minutes for 1871, 1872, and 1873, that it is the foundation on which all the action of Synod, during those years, is based. No other charges were at any time introduced, except those of Dr. Schæffer, p. 8, of Minutes for 1872, of which hereafter, and there is direct reference in the record in each year to the doings of the year preceding. If, as the bill contends, a title to real estate is to be disturbed by a Court of Equity on account of the decisions

of this Ministerium, the Court will want to know whether such decisions are regular; that is, are they binding on any body? In fact the constitution itself allows Synod to act only in cases regularly before it. Section 19 says, "It renders a final decision in all cases in which the action of church councils and conferences, and the affairs of congregations are regularly brought before it."

Upon a review of these proceedings of the Ministerium in this matter, I am satisfied that none of them are entitled to any consideration from this Court, because of their irregularity and bad faith. The reasons for this conclusion are the following:

1st. In Plffs's Appendix, the constitution of 1867, in §116, requires cases of this description to be brought before the conference for its decision. §120 prescribes that in case such disputes cannot be settled by conference, they shall be brought before Synod for final settlement. The reasons for concluding that this matter had been settled by conference in 1869, are given above. That conclusion being correct, the Ministerium had no jurisdiction, for §120 gives it jurisdiction only in case conference cannot effect a settlement.

2nd. These proceedings were instituted without notice, and were carried on without the knowledge of those to be affected thereby. Mr. Anewalt testifies positively that they had no notice; also Mr. Seipel: he adds that the first knowledge they had of the proceedings was through the newspapers; that the congregation was not represented in that Synod. There is no evidence at all to contradict this. This case does not show that the pastor and Vestry of St. Paul's congregation had the slightest intimation either of what charges were to be leveled against them at Pottsville, or what action the Ministerium proposed to take thereon. The minutes for 1870, pp. 3–5, moreover, show that neither Mr. Mennig, nor any lay delegate, was in attendance. The only possible pretence to a notice that can be made is, that they must have known that Conference referred the matter to Synod, in 1869, for advice; but it has already been seen that that reference was permitted to lie dormant for a year, and

then was taken up without any allusion to the original object for which it was made; besides, the respondents were justified in believing that the reference to Synod had been dropped, when Conference acted without the advice. That cannot be construed into a notice sufficient to disturb a title to real estate. Is it not too much to ask of the Civil Courts that, in passing upon the rights of property, they should give full weight to the judgment of an ecclesiastical tribunal, of which the parties interested had no notice? In reply to this it may be said the constitution of 1867 requires no notice in cases of this kind. This may be true of the letter. If so, so much worse for the constitution. Yet it is clearly the spirit of the instrument, that parties called upon to answer should be notified of what is preferred against them. This is a fair construction of §§ 128, 135 and 136, and the President of the Ministerium so understands it, as we shall see hereafter. When Dr. Schæffer had a charge to make, he, though an officer of the Ministerium, was under obligation to give notice, in compliance with the constitution; when those twenty members had a charge to prefer, how were they relieved from this obligation? I cannot see, nor can see how any importance is to be attached to a judgment of Synod without notice.

3rd. It was an act of bad faith towards the pastor and vestry. Conferences are only sub-divisions of the Synod, and must report their proceedings to that body. (Constitution of 1867, §§ 97, 106.) Synod may, therefore, be justly presumed to have known what had been done in the four meetings of Conference in 1869 and 1870, relative to these charges. And when Conference, in 1870, disposed of all the charges, any person would say the matter was then at rest—observe the instructions of Conference, and the law is satisfied. What obligation were the pastor and vestry under to be watchful for further proceedings against them, and that before a body to which they had not been summoned yet at all? And how could the mother synod, in justice to those under her care entertain a charge slipped in without notice to any body. This venerable matron was bound to know before proceeding

that such notice was given, and she could not go on in good faith without such knowledge. Civil Courts do not tolerate such proceedings, how could an ecclesiastical?

The action of the Synod this year (1870) is harmless, independent of the above considerations. It passed five resolutions, four of which are requests, and the fifth refers the charge against the pastor to the Ministerium. (See the minutes pp. 27, 28.) It also appointed a committee (p. 28) to lay these resolutions before the Congregation at Allentown, remove the difficulties, and restore peace. How this committee discharged its duties is told by Mr. Seipel, and Mr. Anewalt. The only importance of the above is to show the connection between the proceedings of this year and the years following.

Turning to the minutes for 1871, p. 8, we find in the President's address an express reference to what had been done in 1870; on p. 9, he tells how the President requested Conference to give attention to the subject, and what Conference did, all of which amounts to nothing, for the Constitution of 1867 gives the President no authority to invoke the action of Conference. To the contrary, § 8, (p. 124) shows that the Synod, not its President, can refer matters to Conference. He then tells of his visit to Allentown and what he found out. This matter goes into the hands of a committee whose report is found on pp. 27, 28 of the minutes. Now, on what is this action based? Not a charge is found in the minutes of 1871. The fact is none were made. The only charges with which Synod as yet has had any thing to do were those of 1870. If this action was based on the President's report, it is replied that that report was on its face designed only to inform Synod, not to be the basis of a judgment. The Pastor and Vestry were not therein called upon to answer. There is no intimation that on it, Synod would proceed to an adjudication by which their rights of property would be cut off. In this year nothing is done with the charges against the pastor.

Next, in 1872, we find by the minutes, pp. 7 and 8, that the subject came up again through the President's report.

At the very outset he refers back to the action of 1871, and what follows in 1872 is but a sequence. This year the presiding officer of the Ministerium, before whom the Vestry were to be tried, and whose first duty it was to see that both parties had exact justice meted out to them, assumes the character of prosecutor. This one member of that body, above all others, was under special obligation to approach this investigation in the spirit of absolute impartiality; and it might seem strange for him to lead the prosecution. The case might have been so clear that every member of the Ministerium, save one, could believe only in the guilt of the respondents; but there was one pair of lips that honor and official propriety ought to have sealed; especially in view of the fact, plainly demonstrated during the preceding two years, that there was no dearth of parties ready to lodge complaints against them. After reviewing the events of the year, he lays this charge: "That they have failed to show proper respect to the requirements of the Constitution, and that they have declined to comply with the injunction solemnly laid upon them by Synod." The pastor was in no way implicated. This charge was solely against the Vestry. In their reply to Dr. Schæffer the Vestry well ask, "what requirements?" How could an allegation be more indefinite? Were the accused to appear in readiness to show their compliance with every section of that lengthy document? It is but reasonable to say that the violated sections should have been specified. Indeed, to listen to such a charge was in direct violation of § 126 of the Constitution, which provides: "no charge shall receive attention, unless it be presented in writing, be specific, and be founded upon the testimony of at least two credible witnesses and be signed by them." The charges in this case did not comply with this section in these particulars; they were not specific, and were not founded on the testimony of at least two credible witneses and signed by them. And to this the prosecutor himself bears witness, for he tells us p. 8 of the minutes for 1872, the charges were founded on rumor. These are his words, "The disorders in this church so long complained of *are said* to have prevailed

during the last winter. *Accordingly*, on April 8th I sent due notice, &c." The Synod therefore proceeded to set at nought its own Constitution, when it proceeded to their consideration. A Court of Equity will show a greater respect for that fundamental law, and pay no attention to the charges.

As to the latter part of these charges, it may be said that, if the views before expressed regarding the regularity of the action of 1871 are correct, that action was a nullity, and the failure of the vestry to comply with those injunctions was no offence.

This report of the President was sent to a committee which reported as follows: "Having carefully examined the correspondence between the President and vestry of this church, we recommend the adoption of the following as the judgment of the Synod in the case." Were any witnesses examined? It would seem not. Were the accused heard? no; but the committee examined the letters, and thereon based their recommendation, which the Ministerium adopted. Now it is clearly shown §§ 126, 128, 129, 130, 131, of the Constitution, that charges must be sustained by the evidence of at least to witnesses, all relevant testimony must be heard, the accused must be heard—and then judgment. Does the Constitution of 1867 admit of so serious a decision, as that on p. 26 of the minutes for 1872, on the strength of the careful examination of a budget of letters? Will a Court of Equity disturb a title to real estate because of such a decision? But, complainants may urge that the sections of the Constitution above cited do not apply to this case, only to cases of ministers. But the prosecutor himself, a high officer of the Ministerium, and called in this case as an expounder of its fundamental law, applied § 128 to this very case; and, if that applies, why not the others? Furthermore, in § 136, these rules are expressly made applicable to any member of a congregation, in all cases of appeals. This interpretation certainly does no violence to the spirit of the law, and follows faithfully the example of the President.

These proceedings of 1872 are the last action of Synod directly concerning the vestry. They are, of course, deeply

interested in the resolution found on p. 22, Minutes of 1873. But this was passed some four months after this bill was filed, and whether it could be applied in deciding the case, might be doubted for that reason. Independent of that, however, the resolution asserts too much; it begs the whole question at issue before this Court. Acknowledge its force, and the complainants are entitled to a decree at once.

Through all these acts of the Ministerium, Mr. Mennig was the subject of charges but once, and then in the paper signed by some twenty members, in 1870. He was not included in Dr. Schæffer's charges in 1872. What became of the charges against him? It will he remembered that they were referred to the Ministerium (Minutes for 1872, p. 20). The Ministerium, on p. 39, has thus recorded its opinion of the charges, "Resolved, that inasmuch as no specific charges against his purity of doctrine have been preferred, the whole matter be referred to the special committee on the St. Paul's German Lutheran Church case, Allentown, already appointed by the Synod;" thus recognizing the necessity of charges being specific, and confirming the position hereinbefore taken concerning the charges against the vestry by Dr. Schæffer in 1872. That committee never reported. They are never heard from in the subsequent records of the Ministerium, except in the President's report in 1871, and he compliments them as having "failed entirely" to do what they had been appointed to do. How then was the charge against Mr. Mennig revived? As follows: at Conference, in Catasauqua, January, 1871, a fresh attempt was made to "restore peace and concord" in this congregation. (The proceedings at Slatington, Oct., 1870, do not seem to have been of much importance.) Charges were again laid against Mr. Mennig, which were submitted to the Ministerium, and the President of the Ministerium was requested to suspend him. This he did not do. Mr. Rath says, that the Catasauqua Conference proceedings were before Synod at Easton, in 1871. The report of the committee on Conference proceedings, p. 21 of Minutes for 1871, contains no record of it. Another effort "to restore peace and concord" was made in April, 1872, at the Wilkesbarre Conference. Again were

charges against the pastor brought, of which Mr. Mennig had notice, but did not attend. Again did Conference resolve to lay them before the Ministerium, but the committee's report on this subject (Minutes for 1872, p. 22) makes no mention of this subject. It was not till 1873, that the Ministerium's committee saw fit to bring the matter before the Ministerium (see p. 21 of Minutes of that year); and the Ministerium then suspends Mr. Mennig. This being done several months after the filing of this bill, and being purely a matter of church discipline, cannot affect at all the questions of rights of property arising in this case. It is interesting, however, to know the finale of these protracted and numerous efforts to "restore peace and concord."

I have sought to give the record of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, in administering law to this congregation; for the reason, that in the latter paragraphs of this bill, great stress is laid on the allegation, that these "New Measures" are opposed to the principles of Lutheranism as accepted by said Ministerium.

Looking now at Mary Livingston's deed, an important suggestion presents itself. The trust therein is for "the said German Evangelical Lutheran Congregation." Nothing in the instrument intimates an intention, that the holding of this property should depend on adhering to the principles accepted by the Ministerium. As long as that congregation is Evangelical Lutheran in its usages, doctrines and principles, no Court will disturb the possession of the trustees; for the end of the trust is accomplished. See also the Charter of the congregation, which does not require the congregation to follow the Ministerium. Besides, it is possible, perhaps, for the Ministerium to err in its acceptances. It might embrace principles hostile to Evangelical Lutheranism; in such case, would these trustees be bound to follow the Ministerium? Certainly not; for they would thus at once forfeit their estate. In Mary Livingston's deed there is nothing to lead the Courts to say that the management of this trust was to be governed by the principles of Evangelical Lutheranism as expounded

by the Ministerium. It is Lutheranism, not Ministeriumism, that is to be promoted thereby.

One more series of facts must be briefly traced. Stung by the action of the Ministerium, in June, 1870, in opening afresh this controversy, a considerable number of members of the congregation presented, Defts' Exhibit D D, to the vestry, requesting them to take the necessary steps to "liberate" them from the Ministerium. In conformity therewith the vestry, on the 3d of July, 1870, appointed a committee to find ways and means to dissolve their connection with it. The allegations of the 15th and 16th paragraphs of the bill, that Mr. Mennig instigated the New Measure party to secede, that he and the other respondents used misrepresentation and deception in accomplishing their ends, are not supported by proof. The facts are, Mr. Mennig was not a leader in this movement. It does not seem that his vestry leaned on his judgment, but their own. Mr. Mennig consented, but no more. This action of vestry of July 3d, 1870, was promptly followed by renewed efforts to "restore peace and concord." Certain members refused to pay a tax levied to pay current expenses of the church. A committee was sent to them to entreat them: they would not. They were then cited to appear before vestry to present their excuses. They didn't come, and on Sept. 14th, 1870, thirteen of them were suspended. After further notice, likewise disregarded, three more were suspended Oct. 31, 1870, and others reported as disobedient. Conference too joined the movement to "restore," passed the resolutions on pp. 36 and 37 of Plffs' Appendix. See the same resolutions in Defts' Exhibit P, somewhat widened in scope. The respondents contend this widening by the Secretary was wholly unauthorized; that he should not have allowed his zeal in a good cause to tinge the discharge of an official duty. Again, in 1872, Mr. Mennig having been re-charged, Conference advised certain members of the congregation to protest against the removal, "and immediately to secure an injunction,"—the first intimation of litigation. The vestry was not checked in the pursuit of their object. April 16th, 1871, they proposed certain amend-

ments, and an addition to the By-Laws of the congregation, and submitted the same to a congregational vote, May 6, 1871; which they had a right to do under §6, of the Charter. These acts were forbidden and protested against by a committee May 5, 1871, but in vain. This additional By-Law was modified Oct. 8, 1871, and March 29, 1872, by what appears to be regular proceedings. Oct. 8, 1871, and Jan. 7, 1872, the vestry call on the pastor to withdraw from the Ministerium. April 14, 1872, Vestry resolves to declare themselves free from the Ministerium, to send no more delegates to Conference or Synod, and to notify those bodies. This action was supplemented by that of Oct. 6, 1872, when the vestry left the question of joining the Synod of East Pennsylvania to a congregational election, to be held Oct. 26, 1872. At this election 102 votes were cast in favor of, and 35 against the proposed annexation; whereupon the vestry, Dec. 22, 1872, reported the result to the East Pennsylvania Synod. Thus did St. Paul's congregation leave the Ministerium, and join the Synod of East Pennsylvania.

The complainants insist that the law does not permit such a removal without the consent of the Ministerium; that the respondents have by thus withdrawing from the Ministerium and joining the Synod of East Pennsylvania forfeited the trust. This is based on, 1st, The ground of antagonism; 2d, The decisions of the Ministerium, both of which have already been considered; and, 3d, The Constitution of the Ministerium. Rev. Mr. Rath testifies that sections 16 and 121 of the Constitution of 1867, prevent a congregation from separating from the Synod at will. Sections 18, 19, and 20, also support this position: there is no express provision in any part of the Constitution of Synod that forbids it. His last answer is this, if there is nothing in the Constitution of the Synod or of the congregation to forbid it, congregations have the right to change their synodical relations. See to the same effect Dr. Schmucker. He says the consent of the Synod would in any case be necessary; that sections 16 and 121 prohibit such removal; their prohibition is implied. See also Dr. Schæffer and Dr. Krauth. For the respondents Dr.

Brown testifies that a Lutheran congregation has the right to change its synodical relations, and this right has been very generally, if not universally, recognized; they have the right to change their synodical relations without the consent of the Ministerium. See also Dr. Hay, who says, a church can decide as to its ecclesiastical relations under any circumstances; it can take the church property into another organization, provided it do not thereby divert it from the uses for which it was originally intended. Dr. Baum also asserts the right, and adds that in changing from the Ministerium to the East Pennsylvania Synod, or from the East Pennsylvania Synod to the Ministerium, no change of doctrine in the congregation is involved.

On this point I believe the law to be this: a congregation has the right to change its synodical relations, of its own motion: Provided such action is not in violation of the constitution of the congregation or of the Synod; and provided that in so doing the congregation does not abandon its doctrines, and so divert its property from the uses for which it was intended. It has not been alleged that such action was a violation of the constitution of this congregation. As to the constitution of the Synod, Rev. Mr. Rath, Dr. Schæffer, and Dr. Krauth unite in saying that it contains no express prohibition of such action. Dr. Schmucker says the prohibition is implied. Mr. Rath says §§ 18, 19, 20 also support the position,—how he does not say. They do not seem to bear on the question one way or the other. §§ 16 and 121 are the ones from which the prohibition is to be implied. The argument is as follows: these sections give the Synod power to dismiss or expel a member; therefore the member cannot withdraw without permission. I do not see how that necessarily follows. How is the one to be implied from the other? An implication, says Bouvier, is "an inference of something not directly declared, but arising from what is admitted or expressed." The power to coerce does not arise from power to dismiss or expel. Section 16 contemplates what would naturally take place in a time of peace. Circumstances making it desirable, a congregation requests dis-

mission; the Synod grants it. All is done in a spirit of friendliness, which both parties, expect to continue. The rules of courtesy would require as much, in the observance of any constitution. Does this imply that the congregation is bound by ties that cannot be dissolved save by Synod? Section 121 relates to discipline. Every Synod must be able to protect itself against the presence of unworthy members; hence the power to expel. But, to say that they can expel the bad, does not carry with it that they can constrain the good to remain forever. In this country associations abound. Probably in all, power to dismiss and expel is found. They do not therefore have power to compel the continuance of membership. A maxim applicable to this question of implication teaches, that the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another. In harmony with this is the doctrine so often applied to organized bodies, that they possess only the powers delegated to them. An eminent author says "whatever things, therefore, it was asserted that the king might do, it was a necessary implication that there were other things which he could not do." Interpreted by these rules, §§ 16 and 121 would give the Synod power only to dismiss and expel, not to retain absolutely. This authority claimed by complainants for the Synod is very grave. When the Constitution of 1867 was framed, had it been intended to bind the congregations forever, willing or unwilling, it would have said so. So serious a matter should not, and could not, have been left to implication. If the complainants are correct, Synod gets a weightier power by implication than by any of the expressions of her constitution.

The question whether this congregation, in leaving the Ministerium for the Synod of East Pennsylvania, abandoned the doctrines of Evangelical Lutheranism, is answered in the negative by what has already been said on the subject of antagonism between the two bodies, under the sixth finding of fact.

The right of a congregation to make such a change is fully recognized by our Supreme Court; I will only cite these authorities, Presbyterian congregation vs. Johnston, 1 W. & S.

9; Trustees vs. St. Michael's congregation 12 W. 20; also Steed et al. vs. McAuley et al. decided on the 11th inst. See Legal Intelligencer of 15th inst. The law applicable to such cases is clearly stated by Justice Sharswood in Schnarr's Appeal, 17 P. F. S., 146. Had the trust in this case been conditioned upon the connection of this congregation with the Ministerium, withdrawal from that body would have worked a forfeiture. As the deed of Mary Livingston reads, however, so long as this congregation adheres to the principles of Evangelical Lutheranism, the conditions of the trust are satisfied, and it matters not whether it is represented in the Ministerium, or the Synod of East Pennsylvania.

The allegation in paragraph 17 of the bill is not entirely correct. Conference did not declare the German Evangelical Lutheran congregation of Allentown to be vacant. The words would seem to relate to the St. Paul's congregation recognized by Synod and Conference, and represented by the complainants.

10. Under the bill, paragraph 18, the general answer, paragraph, 18, and Mr. Mennig's answer, paragraph 9, I find that that portion of St. Paul's congregation represented by complainants, had an election Dec. 30, 1872, at the Academy building, near the church, at which election the complainants were the successful candidates. The validity of this election is of no account, as complainants could sustain this action either as officials or as individuals. The vestry was installed by a committee appointed by Conference, as detailed by Mr. Rath, Plffs' notes, p. 94.

11. Under the bill, paragraph 19, the general answer, paragraph 19, and Mr. Mennig's answer, paragraph 10, I find that the complainants are not the true and lawful vestry of the German Evangelical Lutheran congregation of Allentown, and are not justly entitled to the possession of the church building now in possession of respondents; which follows as a conclusion from what has already been said.

12. The prayer of complainants in the 20th paragraph of the bill must be denied.

13. As to the concluding portion of the two answers filed,

I prefer to say nothing. The allegations therein bear upon the motives of the parties to this controversy. I believe the case can be intelligently and justly decided without making this an issue. There is testimony bearing on this point, reference to which has been avoided, for a most careful study of it would throw no light on the main points before the Master.

14. I suggest the following form of decree:

And now Anno Domini, Eighteen Hundred and Seventy- this cause came on to be heard, at this term, and was argued by counsel, and thereupon, upon consideration thereof, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed as follows, viz.: that the bill of complainants be dismissed, and that the complainants pay the costs of this proceeding.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

J. WINSLOW WOOD, MASTER.

ALLENTOWN, PA., Oct. 18th, 1875.

OPINION OF THE COURT.

* * * * * * *

Assuming jurisdiction, the important question for solution is, have the defendants diverted the trust from the purposes of the donor? The grant of the land was in trust "for the benefit of the German Evangelical Lutheran congregation (now St. Paul's Church), for the purpose of keeping and maintaining a house of worship thereon." This grant was made November 3, 1813.

While the purposes of this grant are for the keeping and maintaining a house of public worship, it must be admitted that no other worship than that of the Evangelical Lutheran faith will satisfy the intent of the donor. Are the defendants of that faith? The Master has found that they are, and that they are also a majority of the congregation, and he therefore recommends a decree of dismissing complainants' bill. The complainants except to this finding, and assert that the Master's finding ought to have been that at the time of this

grant, this congregation was subject to the control of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania.

It must be admitted that the Ministerium was formed possibly as early as 1747; it certainly existed at the time of this grant, and as early as 1781, and 1783, the Allentown congregation is mentioned in their proceedings; and in the years 1802, 1804, and 1811, this congregation was represented at the meetings of the Ministerium. But while this relation to the Ministerium must be received as an established fact, it does not follow that the grant is so indissolubly connected with the Ministerium as to subject the congregation to its control and government. This tribunal was composed exclusively of the clergy, and exercised chiefly ecclesiastical jurisdiction in matters of faith and doctrine; while the church as an organization was sovereign, and independent of this general organization, except in so far as some power had been delegated to its general government. As regards the church polity of the Lutherans, the congregations are the unit of power. Churches are established by an association of individuals, voluntarily agreeing to adopt the Lutheran faith, and hence there is no superior adjudication to be invoked, as in churches of Episcopal origin.

That a church, which has received its origin from a superior tribunal, cannot leave that relation, and secede from that government, must be accepted as a well settled rule of law; but this rule does not apply where the church as an organization is the unit of power, and hence it has been rightfully held, that the majority of a Lutheran congregation may sever its synodical relations, and attach itself to another Synod, Lutheran in faith; St. Michael's church of Pine Hill, 12 Wright 20. In McGinnis et al. vs. Watson 5, Wright 9, and The Presbyterian Congregation vs. Johnson 1 W. & S. 9, it was held that it was not an implied condition of a grant to an incorporated congregation, that it shall remain in connection with any particular church judicatory, or that anything but a radical change of faith or doctrine would have the effect to forfeit its rights in the trust. There is nothing in the grant of Mary Livingston which expressly subjects this

congregation to the government of the Ministerium. A majority, therefore, may sever this relation, and attach the congregation to the East Pennsylvania Synod, which is essentially Lutheran in faith, and is now acting in harmony with the General Synod of the United States, while the Ministerium has seceded from the General Synod, and has founded, with others, a General Council, of the United States.

The Lutheran Congregations in America are divided into general church judicatories, embracing in each many church organizations from the different States; they are as follows: General Council, Synodical Conference, General Synod South, General Synod North, and Independent, and yet in the grand total of the Lutheran denominations, each forms a part. The lesser Synods, which compose these General Synods, being State and inter-State organizations, are numerically designated from 1 to 40 indicating, I presume, the order of the time of their formation, number one, being the eldest, and number forty, the youngest. A reference to the Lutheran Almanac for 1876, pp. 31, 32, (which seemed by both parties in their argument to have been received as authoritative), exhibits the relative congregational strength and membership of these general bodies, as well as of their constituents, the lesser bodies. These statistics confirm the testimony as regards general State and inter-State organizations; and while the congregations composing these general bodies, as well as the general bodies themselves, differ in usages, modes of worship, details of government, some resorting to revivals, protracted meetings, general prayer, and even the anxious bench, as a means of awakening the sinner, yet in all the cardinal doctrines of faith, there is no essential difference; "The word of God, as contained in the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that word," is declared to be the faith and belief of these churches uniting with the General Synod of the United States, as well as of the East Penn-

sylvania Synod, and the Ministerium of Pennsylvania in 1867, as its confession of faith declares, "that the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God given by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, are the clear only and sufficient rule of Faith; that the three General Creeds, the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian, exhibit the faith of the Church universal, in accordance with this rule; that the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, is in all its parts in harmony with the rule of faith, and is a correct exhibition of doctrine;—and that the Apology, the two Catechisms of Luther, the Smalcald Articles, and the Formula of Concord, are a faithful development and defence of the doctrines of the Word of God, and of the Augsburg Confession."

By a comparison of these two confessions, it will be observed, that the one accepts the Word of God as contained in the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the only infallible rule of faith and doctrine, while the other declares that the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God given by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, are the clear, only, and sufficient rule of faith, that the three General Creeds, the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian, exhibit the faith of the church universal in accordance with this rule. Both declare as their infallible rule of faith and doctrine, in exact substance that the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God. While as to the three General Creeds the one is silent, the other declares that these Creeds exhibit the faith of the Church universal, in accordance with this rule; the Creeds are only an exhibition of faith and rule, and are not faith and rule *per sese* or abstractly; they are only the shadow, while faith and this rule are the substance; again the one adopts the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word, and of the faith of our church founded upon that Word; while the other declares that the Unaltered Augsburg Confession is in all its parts in harmony with the rule of faith and is a correct exhibition of doctrine. Here again is a difference of phraseology without any real difference in substance; as regards the Unaltered Augsburg

Confession about which so much has been said, it appears that the Altered Augsburg Confession, has never been extant in this country, and has no standing as a doctrine or faith with any Lutheran congregation here; if it be extant at all, and in use, it must be with European churches. Again, while the one is silent, the other declares, that the Apology, the two catechisms of Luther, the Smalcald Articles, and the Formula of Concord, are a faithful development and defence of the doctrines of the Word of God and of the Augsburg Confession. Here again, the Symbolical Books, which have assumed so prominent a place in the complainants argument are declared to be only, "a faithful development and a defence of the doctrines of the Word of God, and of the Augsburg Confession." It must be admitted that that which is only a development and defence of the doctrines is surely no part of the doctrine itself. This part of the complainants argument can not therefore prevail, because to adopt it, would be to hold, that which is only ancillary, is co-equal with doctrine and faith; the distinction sought to be made does not exist in fact nor substance. The judicial conclusion therefore must be that as regards cardinal doctrines of faith there exists no essential differences between these litigants.

However astute and elaborate may be the arguments and opinions of celebrated and learned divines, as to an essential difference between these declarations of faith, it is to be feared that the attempted distinction is so clouded in a haze of subtleties as to be incomprehensible to the judicial mind: for in the Annville Church controversy, Judge Pearson did not essay the difficult task, but dismissed the subject with the significant and somewhat provincial remark,—"there is scarcely the Hudibrastic distinction" "*twixt tweedle dum and tweedle dee.*"

However earnestly and forcibly a distinction is still sought to be made, yet it appears as a well established fact, that there is a unity in the fundamental doctrine of faith, as well in State as in inter-State organizations, and for many years the Ministerium and the East Pennsylvania Synod acknowl-

edge the General Synod of the United States as their advisory judicatory.

It is true, however, that there is a controversy existing as regards practices called "New Measures;" which is a usage adopted by some churches, as a means of awakening sinners, by the holding of meetings for continued preaching, and praying, and called seasons of revival.

By some celebrated divines, and who generally hold strictly to the Ministerium, this practice is pronounced to be anti-Lutheran, and is very generally discouraged; but, for many years, and long after the establishment of the East Pennsylvania Synod, some churches accepting the advisory government of the Ministerim, practiced this mode of worship, and Lutheran congregations, and their clergy, at pleasure, severed their connection with the Ministerium, and joined the East Pennsylvania Synod and *vice versa.* New Measures were not then pronounced to be an essential difference in faith.

It also seems probable, that in the early history of Lutheranism in this State, and especially toward the close of the last century, and the beginning of this, many congregations had their seasons of revivals not essentially differing from those practiced by the St. Paul's congregation; and that these practices prevailed from a period so remote, that no witness has been able to fix the time of their introduction in this country. It seems to be established that Dr. Muhlenberg and Wrangle, as early as 1761, were accustomed to visit from house to house, for the purpose of conversing with, and praying for, awakened souls; and at that early day, and subsequently, revivals took place in the Lutheran churches. Dr. Helmuth's book, published in 1794, shows that during the regular church service the penitence of the awakened sinner was manifested by tears and sobbings (and after service, and during renewed prayers), "By supplications, sighs, groans, and increased tears, and by throwing themselves into the arms of a reconciled Father."

If such were the practices of many Lutheran congregations in the time of Dr. Muhlenberg, how can it be said, that the majority of the members of St. Paul have forfeited their

right to the church property by so doing? and when certainly no more has been done than was done by the founders of the Church in this State, and no more than has been done at a later period by Dr. Schæffer, and others, who now hold to the Ministerium.

As regards church history, page upon page, even aggregating a respectable volume, as a fitting appendix to this case, might be written, but which would be only interesting as showing the development of the church, and not useful in determining the rights of this litigation; and, besides, the Master's Report is so replete in its history, and so correctly considered in its legal conclusions, that any elaborate opinion by this Court, would be an affectation of labor and supererogatory.

I am so clearly of the opinion that Keller et al. vs. Weaver et al. C. P. of Lebanon Co., in Equity, No. 27, November Term, 1863, affirmed by the Supreme Court June 29, 1865, (not reported,) has decided the very matter here in dispute, that it must be accepted as binding and conclusive. In that case, as in this, the defendants were a majority of the congregation, holding possession of the church, and the plaintiffs a dissatisfied minority, claiming the possession upon the allegation, that as early as 1805 several lots of ground were acquired in fee in the town of Annville by the Evangelical Lutheran and German Reformed congregations, and that the Lutheran congregation was subject to the Ministerium, and that in 1842 the defendants withdrew from it, and attached themselves to the East Pennsylvania Synod, and that as New Lutherans, they had separated from the Old Lutherans, and introduced, as a mode of worship, revivals and protracted meetings, and the anxious bench as a means of conversion during these services of preaching and prayer. A most careful reading of the Annville case fails to disclose any real ground to distinguish it from the St. Paul's case, as regards the points in litigation.

In both cases, the acquisition of the church property was long prior to the formation of the East Pennsylvania Synod; both had maintained by its ministers and lay delegates, for

a long while, a representation in the Ministerium, and General Synod; both have introduced in their modes of worship, practices, called New Measures; and both have severed their relation with the Ministerium and are now represented in the East Pennsylvania Synod, and the General Synod of the United States.

It is said that the Annville case, ought not to be accepted as binding authority, because it has not been reported and in subsequent adjudications it has not been cited, and that it was not a well considered case, because it was not affirmed by a *per curiam* order, and not by a well written and digested opinion of the Supreme Court.

As I understand the practice in the Supreme Court, an unqualified affirmance is the strongest and most acceptable one which can be made; and because, a case is not reported, it is to be regarded as an indication, that the principles involved have been so long and well settled, as not to require a republication of them. The Annville case had to support it, the cases of St. Michael's Evangelical Church of Pine Hill 12 Wright 20; McGinnis et al. vs. Watson, 5 Wright 9; and the Presbyterian Congregation vs. Johnson 1 W. & S. 9.

It is supposed by complainants, that by some of the later decisions these cases have been modified, and that an indication is manifested to overrule them, and to sustain this supposition, Schnorr's Appeal, 17 Smith, 138, and Roshi's Appeal, 19 Smith, 462, are relied on. A careful reading of Schnorr's Appeal will show, that the Butler Reformed Church was organized and endowed upon the express condition, that "it shall be subject to the control of the Synod of the German Reformed Church in the United States, and shall in all respects be governed by its rules and regulations." The ruling is, that a majority of the congregation cannot absolve themselves from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of that Synod; and while this is the exact point decided, it is also said in the same opinion, that "if a church be not described in the original donation, or subscription as under any particular ecclesiastical jurisdiction, it may change its relation, provided there be no radical departure from the original faith or doctrine."

Roshi's Appeal, is the case of the German Reformed Church of Greenwood township, organized in 1835, by the authority of the German Reformed Synod of the United States, and in its fact is similar to, and in its ruling is an unqualified affirmation, of Schnorr's Appeal.

The very last ruling of the Supreme Court, in Steed et al. vs. McCauly et al., Legal Intelligencer, Oct. 15, 1875, page 370, (known as the Fifth Reformed Presbyterian Church) reaffirms the ruling of St. Michael's Church. Viewing this case as I do, I can arrive at no other conclusion than that the Master's Report is correct, as well in fact as in law. The form of decree, therefore, recommended by the Master will be adopted.

My brother associate, Judge Laury, believing it to be his duty to yield his opinion to that of his brother, the President Judge, in principles of law involved and declared in this case, unites in this decree, but desires to say, if it were not for this duty, he would have entered his dissent from the decree now made.

And now, Jan. 17th, A. D. 1876, this cause came on to be heard, and was argued by counsel, and thereupon, upon consideration thereof, it is ordered, adjudged, and decreed, as follows: That the bill of complainants be dismissed, and that the complainants pay the costs of this proceeding.

By the Court:

A. B. LONGAKER, P. J.

An appeal by the plaintiffs, being taken from the decree of the Court of Common Pleas of Lehigh County, to the Supreme Court, the following is the decision of that tribunal of final appeal, as reported in *The Legal Intelligencer*, September 8, 1876.

1. In the absence of sufficient evidence of plain mistake the facts reported by the Master and affirmed by the Court below will be considered as properly found.

2. Adherence to the doctrines and form of worship of the

church to which the property is dedicated by the donor is the criterion of the right of property.

3. St. Michael's Church, 12 Wright, 20, Schnorr's Appeal, 17 P. F. Smith, 138, Roshi's Appeal, 19 id. 462, followed and affirmed.

Per Curiam. May 8th, 1876.

The very careful, exhaustive and comprehensive report of the Master in this case, affirmed by the Court below, requires us to consider the facts reported by him as properly found, in the absence of sufficient evidence of a plain mistake. This is the general rule, and we have seen nothing in the evidence to demand a departure from it, or to convict him of plain error. The report was evidently well considered, and the evidence vouched to support the Master's conclusions. We therefore accept his finding of fact as true—that the congregation in the possession of the property granted by Mary Livingston have not departed from the doctrines and form of worship for the benefit and support of which she dedicated her property. The defendants claiming, and found by the Master and the Court below, to be the true "German Evangelical Lutheran Congregation of the borough of Northampton," and therefore entitled to retain the property under her grant. Adherence to the doctrines and form of worship of the Church to which the property is dedicated by the donor is the criterion of the right of property; and when the order of church government is also prescribed in the grant, or plainly deducible from it, church governmental connection is likewise essential. These principles are clearly set forth in the case of St. Michael's Pine Hill Church, 12 Wright, 20; Schnorr's Appeal, 17 P. F. Smith, 138; and Roshi's Appeal, 19 P. F. Smith, 462; and have been properly applied to the facts of this case.

Decree affirmed and appeal dismissed, and costs to be paid by the appellants.

ARTICLE II.

THE RELATION OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGES TO CHRISTIANITY.*

By President JAMES B. ANGELL, LL. D., of the University of Michigan.

The committee who invited me to present a paper to this body, assigned me as a theme, "The Relations of our Higher Institutions of Learning to Christianity." But, they kindly informed me, that any modification of this subject, which I might desire, would be permitted. The topic named is so broad, that it would be difficult to bring a profitable discussion of it within the proper limits of a paper suitable for this occasion, and therefore I have availed myself of the liberty granted me, and shall consider merely the relations of the American Colleges to Christianity.

We first encounter the familiar fact, that the Colleges owe their existence to Christianity, to the God-fearing men who settled our country, and to their descendants who inherited their appreciation of Christian learning. Even in most, if not all, of the cases, in which Colleges have been founded or cherished by the States, it is plain that the love of thorough education which the American churches have nourished in the public mind has given them their being. As we all know, the dominant idea in founding our earlier Colleges was to train up a thoroughly equipped body of ministers. The course of study was specially adapted to that end. And most successfully the end was accomplished. For the first sixty years in the life of Harvard College, more than half the graduates were preachers. More than three-fourths of the men who graduated from Yale, in the first twelve years of

*A paper read before the United States Evangelical Alliance at the conference held at Detroit, Oct. 30—Nov. 2, 1877.

her history, and nearly one-half of all the alumni for the first thirty years, were ministers. For a quarter of a century before the Revolution, one-half of the graduates of Princeton entered the ministry. Prof. Tyler, of Amherst College, to whose work on Prayer for Colleges I am indebted for these figures, says, that of thirty-five thousand graduates of our Colleges previous to 1846, nearly one-fourth were preachers. We know that in the period of religious decline which followed the Revolution, the number of pious students and of course the number of candidates for the ministry was greatly diminished. But in the second and third decades of this century, the number of such candidates rapidly increased again. As the idea that collegiate education was chiefly of importance to preachers lost its power, and the conviction grew that it was equally serviceable to men of other professions, the proportionate number of clerical graduates naturally diminished. We may say, that for at least fifty years, the purpose of training men for all honorable secular pursuits, no less than that of training candidates for the ministry, has stimulated the benefactors and guided the corporations and faculties of Colleges. The scope of these institutions has become broader and more generous, but the aim of their guardians has been to have the life and the instruction of the Colleges imbued with a positive Christian spirit. The teachers selected have been for the most part religious men. They have been expected to engage more or less in direct religious labor with their pupils. They have been supposed to stand towards the students *in loco parentis.* Attendance of pupils on college prayers, and generally on the stated preaching of the Gospel, has been enforced with more or less stringency. Days of special prayer for Colleges, and other institutions of learning have been observed by the Colleges themselves and by many churches. Most, if not all, of the Colleges have been visited repeatedly by marked revivals of religion.

The Colleges have thus been remembered and cherished by the churches. They have a record of a positive and profoundly interesting spiritual life. The Colleges have repaid

the churches for all their care and solicitude, by sending out generation after generation of men, to fill our pulpits, and to adorn with a Christian character and life every honorable calling. The laymen, not less than the preachers, who have come forth from the Colleges, trained for commanding influence, and devoted to the service of their Lord and Master, are "a crown of rejoicing" to these institutions. Thousands, both of the clergy and of the laity, whose lives have enriched and strengthened our churches beyond measure, have in College received their first impulse to religious life. As a historical fact, the relation of the Colleges to the churches has been one fruitful of great good and, we may fairly say, reciprocally beneficial. The history of the Colleges is a large part of the history of Christian progress in this land.

But, it must be confessed, that we do now sometimes hear men, Christian men, intelligent men, expressing grave doubts whether Colleges, whatever they may have done in the past, are now contributing to the growth of Christianity. Nay, we have heard some go so far as to express the opinion that they are actually injuring the spiritual life of the people. If these doubts and this opinion are well founded, the Christian Church and the friends of Colleges have a very grave matter for consideration before them. I believe that there is no good foundation for the doubts or the opinion, and that, as a body, the Colleges are doing as good work for Christianity as they have ever done. The condition and the details of their work have changed in some respects, but the spirit and the results of their influence on Christian life have not essentially changed.

There never was a time, when some men did not doubt whether the good influences in a College were not counteracted by the temptations of college life, and the moral downfall of a certain proportion of students. There never was a time when some parents did not hesitate, and when others did not refuse, to send their boys to College, on account of the supposed moral perils to be encountered there. But no one, familiar with the history of American Colleges, will now venture to say, that for the first half of this century, the Colleges,

whatever may have been the vices of some of their students, were not sources of moral and religious strength to the nation. There was no such general pollution within them as to poison and paralyze the moral vigor of their life. The knowledge of this mistaken judgment of some of the fathers, may suggest to us the probability that a similar error of hasty or incorrect generalization from a few facts is committed by many now. If there is any one point on which college officers, who have been familiar with our Colleges for thirty or more years, are substantially agreed, it is this, that within that period there has been a marked and manifest gain in the morals and manners of college students—a conclusion which receives confirmation at almost every Commencement dinner, by unsavory reminiscences which some gray-haired men have the wretched taste to offer, of the escapades and immoralities of their time in College.

Some persons seem inclined to think that there has been a decline in the religious earnestness of faculties and governing bodies of Colleges, because there has been a change in certain usages. Whereas, chapel services used to be held twice a day, they are now observed only once, and that single service, instead of being held by lamp-light in the morning, when attendance upon it cultivated so many laudable habits and self-denying virtues, is appointed at some after-breakfast hour, or perhaps at an afternoon hour, when the most self-indulgent sybarite can easily be present. Attendance upon only one divine service on Sunday is required, and at some institutions where the average age of the students is twenty or twenty-one years—an age at which few judicious parents would deem it wise to compel the attendance of their sons on church, faculties are not very strict about enforcing the rules of attendance. In some institutions they even venture to believe, that if a young man of twenty one does incline to go to church, it may be of doubtful expediency to compel him to go, and content themselves with encouraging attendance by all proper means, and especially by furnishing some attractive preaching.

So, too, there have been some changes in the mode of applying the theory of parental supervision. That theory came to

us from the English College, where the undergraduates live under one roof, boarding in commons, shut in at a certain hour in the evening, and are supposed to be for most purposes members of a common family. In one important particular, the English idea has seldom or never been realized here, viz, the presence of the student in his room at night has not been secured. The visitation of rooms, when practiced, generally occurred before nine o'clock P M., and unless there was some special disturbance the rooms were not visited after that time. There was nothing to prevent a student in a town of much size from being out through the whole or a part of the night. I need hardly remind old graduates that most of the moral perils beset us students in those late hours. Now commons have been abandoned in many Colleges. Students room in private houses. The multiplication of classes has made it impossible to fix study hours, when students may be required to be in, subject to visitation. In a greater or less degree, close and constant and minute supervision of the student's mode of passing his time has been abandoned.

But none of these changes bespeak any diminution in the effective care of the student, or in solicitude for his moral and spiritual welfare. The habits of students are as well known to their instructors as they ever were, and a drift in the wrong direction is as promptly and vigorously and wisely arrested as it ever has been. If religious exercises are not thought by faculties to be edifying, in proportion to the discomfort attending them, if undergraduates are treated more as men less as boys, than formerly, it by no means follows that college life is less conducive than it once was to the growth of Christian virtues.

But there is among many good men a more prolific source of anxiety concerning the religious condition of Colleges than those which have been named. This cause of solicitude is the unsettled state of opinion—we may perhaps call it the skeptical state of mind—of many students, upon some or all of the fundamental truths of revealed religion. The parent sees with sadness and alarm that his boy, who left him with a simple and unquestioning faith in the doctrines of his church,

returns with a mind full of grave and embarrassing questions. If the father has not had a philosophic training, or if he is not well read in the current scientific discussions, he is probably appalled. He is sure that his son has made shipwreck of his faith. And this disaster, so far as he can see, is due to his life at College. It is not strange, therefore, that he should think the influence of college training and life unfriendly to religion. But it is strange that some pastors, who are familiar both with college life and with the history of the development of young men, should agree with him in such an unjust and erroneous conclusion.

That many students in Colleges are in this unsettled state of mind, which has been referred to, is not for a moment to be questioned. But that the Colleges are responsible for the fact, or that it is a particularly alarming fact, I do not believe. The truth is, that these students are passing through a transitional period in belief, which comes to every man of any activity and independence of thought. It is the period when his intelligence and manliness require that he should no longer cherish his hereditary beliefs, because they are hereditary, but when he must justify them to his own reason and conscience. He is compelled to look for himself—not alone through his father's or his pastor's eyes—and see on what the bulwarks of his faith rest. Truths, which he has deemed almost axiomatic, are necessarily inspected anew, perhaps challenged to show their credentials and vindication. His active mind, once started on the train of inquiry, suggests queries or doubts innumerable, on almost every point in philosophy and theology. For a time, nothing seems to him determined. He can hardly find an axiom, on which his mind rests with confidence and content. He is ready to question whether his own existence is a dream.

Now, however sincere and earnest this inquiring doubter, his position is not altogether free from peril. He may lose himself in his labyrinth of doubt, and never find a clew by which he regains the light. Some men have never come out.

He is not there, however, because he is in College, but because, if he has an intelligent mind, wherever he is, he must

perforce raise and answer in some way these questions, which press upon most earnest youth, when they cease to lean on parental arms, and go forth to think and act for themselves. If their faith is to be a working force to them as rational beings, it must in some way be verified to their reason. These troubled doubters or inquirers are found outside as well as inside of Colleges, and if the questions of such are not so sharply put, if the exact limits of their uncertainties are not so accurately defined, as those of the college student, I believe that on this account, they are not so likely as the college student to find the answers they seek, or to reach the domain of fixed belief. For a person in these wanderings, I doubt if there is any place so helpful as the American College. For in the College there are companions enough who can sympathize with him in his troubles, and understand him. They do not brand him as a heretic. They do not despair of his escape from his embarrassments. Many of them, who are one stage farther on than he in experience, have been enveloped in the same shadows, and have emerged victorious at last. They have patience to wait for him. They have skill to combat his arguments. They have faith to pray for him. Then, too, in the faculty there are sure to be some men, who have had large opportunities for observing and studying the difficulties of students. Their counsel is at his service. His speculative troubles are not new to them. They can meet the dialectics with which his mind, groping and stumbling, is confusing itself. They can often take him by the hand, and help him from the slough into which his own efforts seemed to be sinking him deeper and deeper every day.

What college officer, of any experience, could not give us the names of a score of preachers, eminent to day in all holy work, whom they saw in College struggling through this transitional period, and seeming at times almost hopelessly bewildered, but coming out at last into the clear light of a rational and intelligent faith, and rendering, through long years, inestimable service in guiding others in the path of truth? Nay, has it not been one of the peculiar glories of the College, that its happy and helpful influences have brought

so many a strong man safely through this great spiritual crisis and saved him to the church, when under less auspicious circumstances, in the whirl of business life, in the spiritual solitude of a great city, he might have forever wrecked his faith and his rational religious hope? The phenomenon we are considering is not a new one. It is a very old one, and has always been known in our Colleges. Yet, year after year, these Colleges have been furnishing to the Church its great majority of thoroughly trained preachers, and a still larger company of high-minded laymen, and a good proportion of all these religious graduates have, while under the college roof, passed through more or less of these questioning experiences. There is in them no grave cause for alarm, and none at all for criticism of the Colleges.

In addition to the men, who are seriously disturbed while reviewing their hereditary beliefs, there is another class for whose professed doubts the Colleges are sometimes unjustly blamed. I refer to those who deem it a mark of intellectual force and manly independence, to express doubts of all accepted beliefs, and to challenge all opinions, especially those which have been held sacred. Their doubting is generally a mere show, put on by a false pride. The skeptical vocabulary which they flaunt hardly serves to conceal their poverty of thought or shallowness of nature. These men are able to impose on others and on themselves more successfully out of College than in College. Their classmates measure them more accurately than other men do, and cure them with those drastic remedies which students apply so effectively to affectation and pretence. I think this particular type of the skeptical disease is less serious in its consequences in College than anywhere else.

Once more, some are fearful that the Colleges are exerting a harmful influence on religious life, because they are giving increasing attention to the natural and the physical sciences, and some of the chief masters of those sciences are putting forth doctrines, which tend to disbelief in the Scriptures and in all the cardinal principles of Christianity, and lead straight to atheistic materialism.

To this I reply, first, the scientific courses in most of the Colleges are not sufficiently prolonged to be very perilous, on any hypothesis. Secondly, if the Colleges were interpreting science in accordance with the theories objected to, it would be necessary in adjudging the responsibility for the dissemination of them, to remember that all modern literature, and especially the magazine literature, is constantly referring to those theories. It is impossible for any intelligent man to remain altogether ignorant of them, even if it were desirable. But, thirdly, the Colleges do in fact teach science in a conservative spirit, and by their courses in psychology, metaphysics, and ontology, furnish the strongest arguments which the human mind can present against atheistic and materialistic beliefs. The instruction given in the senior year by Dr. Porter, of Yale, Dr. McCosh of Princeton, Dr. Robinson, of Brown, Dr. Seelye, of Amherst, Dr. Anderson, of Rochester, Dr. Cocker, of our State University, Dr. Bascom, of Wisconsin, and other teachers of like spirit, is the very best corrective young men can have of extreme scientific tendencies in speculative thought. If there is danger to religious faith in the present state of scientific discussion, nowhere has the intelligent young man so many safeguards against "the oppositions of science," whether so-called falsely or truly, as in the walls of the Colleges.

If the Colleges are to be criticised at all in their relation to the present controversy between science and religion, it seems to me that they are to be complained of for giving too little rather than too much instruction in science. One of the most damaging facts for the defenders of religious faith against the attacks of certain scientific investigators, is the lack of thorough scientific knowledge which characterizes the defence. Not a few preachers, whose zeal outruns their discretion, hurry to the fray without adequate acquaintance with the facts on which the opinions which they deem heresies, scientific, philosophical, and religious, are based. It does not help the matter to say that the scientists, in their attacks, often display a lack of thorough knowledge of metaphysics and theology, and that as scientists they have prop-

erly nothing to do with either metaphysics or theology. If these attacks are to be successfully met, their real nature must be thoroughly understood and fairly set forth. Misunderstanding or misrepresentation of an opponent, whether from ignorance or design, is a weakness in polemics, and is in every way unworthy of a Christian combatant. The College curriculum, crowded to repletion, can do nothing more than give the future preacher the elements of scientific knowledge, with which he can subsequently proceed himself, so far as at least to appreciate the methods of scientific investigators and the significance of their discoveries. The only formal training most preachers do receive in science is given by the Colleges at present. We may properly regret that the course is necessarily so brief. There is no ground for complaining that it is too long, or that it is given in an irreverent and mischievous spirit.

Science, truly read and interpreted as the mode of God's working in nature, must become the ally of the Church. The true policy for the Church is not to stand aloof from it and anathematize it, much less to flee affrighted from it as from some demoniacal monster, but to send her ablests sons to explore its mysteries, to welcome its indisputable discoveries, even when they strike down some of our long-cherished beliefs, and to be confident that as God is one, so His truth is one and will prevail.

Whatever science may have to reveal to us of God's truth, we may be sure that it will be reconcilable with Christian truth. Let us push on with brave hearts, confident that whatever temporary difficulty we find in matching all the different parts of God's truth together, they are really parts of one whole, and we shall in time see them to be so. We may have to modify our exegesis of Scripture, as the generations before us have often done. We may have to change some of our notions of the divine method of operations in the material world, of which we now know so little. But the fundamental notions of our theistic and Christian faith will be cherished so long as the constitution of man remains what it is.

For they are imbedded in it, and answer to those deep wants of the human soul, which nothing else can satisfy.

So far, then, from fearing that the Colleges are, as schools of science, nursing infidelity, I believe they are furnishing the best antidotes within their reach to any evil tendencies in the science of our day, and that most of the teachers in them are doing science and religion an equal service by stimulating pupils to the earnest, honest, courageous pursuit of truth, and by impressing them with the conviction of the essential harmony of all truth.

There is one happy influence of college life on the Christian spirit of undergraduates, which it is especially proper to advert to in this body, which seeks to emphasize Christian fellowship among the various denominations. There can be no question that the associations of college life tend to break down sectarian prejudices, and to cherish a broad and generous catholicity of Christian feeling. Young men, who perhaps have had at home little Christian companionship outside of their particular church, here find themselves brought into most intimate relations with good men of every shade of Christian belief. In all the religious life and work in College, they heartily co-operate with men of different communions, waiving their minor differences, and holding steadily before them their common love of the Master. This experience has a most wholesome and liberalizing effect upon their characters. For the same reason, the professors in Colleges are generally imbued with a catholic and unsectarian spirit. At and near its chief seats of learning any denomination generally shows a less degree of narrowness than elsewhere.

Another question is sometimes raised in connection with this discussion, which it might be deemed affectation in me to ignore. And I am sure I have no desire to ignore it. The question is this. Suppose all you have said about the relation of Colleges to Christianity to be true of the old denominational Colleges, what is to be said of the life and influence of the State Universities, which are rising to such eminence in the West? Is the tendency of their spirit and work friendly or hostile to Christian doctrine and life? That is a

perfectly proper question, and a very important question. For by their endowments, these Universities are enabled to place strong men in their faculties, to secure libraries, scientific museums, and ample means of illustrating instruction, to furnish education almost without cost to the student, and so attract large numbers of young men and young women to their halls. In most if not all the States in which these Universities are established, the attendance upon them is larger than the attendance at any one of the denominational Colleges. It is, then, a matter of great interest to know in what spirit these institutions are administered, especially in their collegiate departments. My answer to the inquiry raised will be principally drawn from my knowledge of the institution with which I am connected. But I have reason to believe that what I say of it is essentially true of the other State Universities, with possibly a single exception.

Its organization was accomplished, its life has been fostered, its policy has been shaped mainly by earnest, reverent, religious men. Seeing that a liberal grant from the United States Government was available for the endowment of a University, and that with the limited private resources of the people it would require a very long time to secure the upbuilding of denominational Colleges with ample means, they favored the establishment of a State institution, which, without heavily burdening the citizens for its support, could promtly furnish their children with a thorough education of as high grade as was afforded in the Eastern Colleges. They perceived that they might thus save two or three generations of well educated men to the State and the Church. For, judging by the rate of growth of the great Colleges of the East, they would have had to wait a hundred years to secure one single institution as amply equipped for work as the University of Michigan now is.

They made the organization of the new College exactly like that of all the other Colleges, save that for some years the office of President was held by different professors in turn, but finally the Rev. Dr. Tappan was called to the presidency. I am not aware, that in any important particular during its

existence, the administration of the College in respect to the moral and religious character of the students has differed from that of the so-called denominational Colleges. Prayers have been attended, formerly twice a day, in late years once a day, a certain number of special Sunday services, at which sermons or discourses were given by the president and other members of the faculty have been held in some one of the University buildings, and individual professors in connection with their churches and Sunday-schools, or in private interviews or Bible classes, have labored as they saw fit with the students. For seventeen years a Young Men's Christian Association, to which a room is assigned, has been the centre of religious life and activity among the students, and in connection with its meetings, which are held tri-weekly, and often daily, there have been some most interesting revivals of religion. The professors have from the beginning been devout, earnest, God-fearing men, and have labored and taught in an unsectarian and catholic, but in a positive Christian spirit. I venture to say, that no one of them has felt himself so fettered, that he could not freely exercise his Christian activity. A few years ago some free-thinkers memorialized the legislature, charging that we were teaching sectarianism. A committee visited us, made a thorough examination, took testimony, and reported to the legislature that we were doing our work in that pure and unsectarian Christian spirit which the people of Michigan approve, and their report was accepted as entirely satisfactory. The public sentiment of Michigan is heartily in sympathy with Christianity. Michigan is a Christian State, and her University can be true to her only by cherishing a broad unsectarian, but earnest Christian spirit. I think that her sister Universities in the Northwest, are pervaded by the same spirit, and that they are contributing their full share to the dissemination of a Christian culture.

It is asked, whether there is not danger that they may fall under the control of men adverse to the old faith? I might ask, whether some facts, well known to this body, do not remind us that a close corporation may, in the lapse of time,

change its character and that of the College or Theological Seminary committed to its charge. In the one case, as in the other, there is no safeguard for the future, save in the perpetuation of the right sentiment in those who do or may control tne fortunes of the College or University. If the religious citizens of these Northwestern States fail to exercise the power which they have as citizens in directing their State Colleges and Universities, it is possible that men with a different spirit will change their character and influence. It seems to me not inappropriate that a body like this, which seeks to unite all good men, of all branches of Christ's Church, in every worthy work, should have its attention directed to this privilege and duty of Christian men in the West.

If the views presented in this paper are correct, the fears expressed by some that our American Colleges are not furnishing valuable help to our Christianity, or that at least their earnestness and positive Christian influence have suffered a marked decline, are entirely unfounded. I believe that, as a whole, never in their history were they under the guidance of a more worthy and devoted company of men than those who now direct their fortunes and fill their chairs of instruction. I believe that their has been a decided and steady improvement during the last fifty years in the manners and morals of college students. I am sure there has been in the thirty years and more over which my personal knowledge of college life extends. Colleges and college students are often subject to unjust censure, because the sins of the students, if committed at all, are necessarily conspicuous. They are known to the whole college community. Some newspapers seem to take delight in publishing them abroad, and so the escapade of a single boy is more talked of than a year's study and unostentatious work of a whole class of worthy men. I should have no fear of drawing a thousand college students by lot from our Colleges to-day, and comparing their moral and religious character with that of any thousand of the same age drawn from our counting houses and stores. I have faith in them, in their character, in their

promise, in their future. I have faith in the American College. It is to-day worthy of its origin, worthy of its history, worthy of the support and confidence of all good men. In spite of those fears about it, which I have thought it my duty to comment on at this time, I believe that it never had, and never deserved, a stronger hold on the affections of the Christian Church, and the whole public, than it has at this moment. A sad day, indeed, would it be for both the College and the Church, if the College should so far drift from its present position as to forfeit the confidence of wise Christian friends of learning, or if the Church, from idle fears or mistaken caution, should fail to exercise its legitimate influence in imbuing all schools of learning with the warmest spirit of devotion to Him, the fear of whom is the very beginning of wisdom.

ARTICLE III.

THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION AND THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.

By John G. Morris, D. D., LL. D., Balt., Md.

The Augsburg Confession is the doctrinal magna charta of all Protestantdom. Just as all free nations of the earth have drawn their principles of civil government from the English "Great Charter of Liberties," extorted from King John, in 1215, so all Protestant organizations have based their Formulas of Faith upon the greater "Bill of Rights," extorted from Charles V. in Augsburg, 1530.

An interesting and instructive analogy might be drawn between these two famous declarations of civil and religious principles.

The Augsburg Confession was the first Confession of Faith adopted after the Reformation was begun, and the substance of it and, in many instances, its precise language have been incorporated into every similar Declaration adopted by other Communions since that day. It is the standard of pure Pro-

testantism, and under this banner our triumphs have been achieved.*

It is our purpose, in this paper, to show to what extent the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, and indirectly all other Protestant Confessions, are indebted to the Augsburg Confession, as well as the influence which the Lutherans of Germany had upon the English divines of those days in forming their theological basis, not only in their Declaration of Faith, but also in the completion of their Liturgy and Homilies.

The testimony shall be principally derived from eminent divines of the English Church, accompanied by that of other writers of established reputation. All these quotations are taken from the original sources.

In the year 1804, Archbishop Laurence, a distinguished dignitary of the Church of England, preached eight sermons before the University of Oxford, on "An attempt to illustrate those articles of the Church of England which the Calvinists improperly considered Calvinistical." These sermons constitute a volume of the Bampton Lectures; the new edition from which these quotations are made, is that of Oxford, 1820. The discourses are illustrated by learned and extensive notes.

The nature of the sermons may be inferred from the

---

* Its influence extends far beyond the Lutheran Church. It struck the key note to other evangelical Confessions and strengthened the cause of the Reformation every where. It is, to a certain extent also, the Confession of the Reformed and the so-called union churches in Germany, namely, with the explanation and modifications of the author himself, in the edition of 1540. In this qualified sense, either expressed or understood, the Augsburg Confession was frequently signed by Reformed divines and princes, even by John Calvin, while ministering to the Church in Strasburg, and as delegate to the Conference in Ratisbon, 1541; by Favel and Beza, at the Conference in Worms 1557; by the Calvinists, at Bremen, 1562; by Frederick III. (Reformed) Elector of the Palatinate, at the Convention of Princes in Nuremberg, 1561, and again at the Diet of Augsburg, 1566; by John Sigismund of Brandenburg in 1614.—*Schaff, Creeds of Christendom*, I. 235.

themes which are here given. 1. The General Principles of the Reformation from its commencement to the period when our Articles were composed, shewn *to be of a Lutheran tendency.* II. The same *tendency* pointed out in the Articles themselves, as deducible from the history of their composition. III. On Original Sin, as maintained by the Scholastics, the Lutherans and our own Reformers. IV. On the tenet of the Schools respecting merit *de congruo*, and that of the Lutherans in opposition to it. V. The Article of "Free Will" and of "Works before Sanctification," explained in connection with the preceding controversy. VI. On the Scholastical doctrine of Justification, the Lutheran and that of our own Church. VII. The outline of the Predestinarian system stated, as taught in the Schools, and as christianized by Luther and Melanchthon. VIII. The Seventeenth Article considered in conformity with the sentiments of the latter, and elucidated by our baptismal service. Brief recapitulation of the whole.

We should like to give copious extracts from this learned work, but we are compelled to be brief.

In Sermon I. p. 12, the Archbishop says:

"In this country, where the light of literature could not be concealed, nor the love of truth suppressed, Lutheranism found numerous proselytes, who were known by the appellation of 'The men of the new learning.' This was particularly the case after the rupture with the see of Rome."

Henry VIII., at that time King of England, undertook to reform the doctrine of the English Church, and the more effectually to propagate the new principles in his dominions and to accelerate the arduous task in which he was engaged, invited the ever memorable Melanchthon, to come to his assistance. That he did not solicit the co-operation of Luther on this occasion, should not, perhaps, be solely attributed to his personal dislike of the Reformer; he well knew that the Protestant Princes themselves, at the most critical period, had manifested a greater partiality for Melanchthon, and hence he urged the latter to come and help him, but he refused. *

---

*Note from Laurence. "After the commencement of our Refor-

Laurence proceeds to say, "Melanchthon * * * possessed every requisite to render truth alluring and reformation respectable, and hence upon him, in preference, the Princes of Germany conferred the honor of compiling the public profession of their Faith. When Henry therefore applied for the assistance of this favorite divine, by seeking the aid of one to whom Lutheranism had been indebted for her Creed, he places beyond suspicion, the nature of that change which he meditated. * * * Some popular instructions were either published (before this) or sanctioned by royal authority, which, with the exception of a few points only, *breathed the spirit of Lutheranism.* Of this no one at all conversant with the subject can for a moment doubt, who examines with attention the contents of what were at that time denominated *The Bishop's Book* and *The King's Book*, the two most important publications of the day." p. 195.

In speaking of a short code of doctrines,* which had been drawn up long before the death of Henry, the Archbishop says:

"Nor is complete originality even here to be met with:

---

mation, Melanchthon was repeatedly pressed personally to assist in completing it, both in Henry's and Edward's reign. In a letter dated March, 1534, he says, "Ego jam alteris literis in Angliam vocor." Ep. p. 717, and again October of the following year: "Ego rursus in Angliam non solum literis sed legationibus et vocor et exerceor." Ep. p. 732. Ed. Lond. 1642. The cause, however, why he did not come then, as at first he intended, (for the Elector of Saxony had consented to his journey, and Luther was anxious for it,) he explains in another letter to Camerarius: "Anglicae profectionis cura liberatus sum. Postquam enim tragici casus in Anglia acciderunt, magna consiliorum mutatio secuta est. Posterior regina (viz., Anne Boleyn), magis accusata quam convicta adulterii, ultimo supplicio affecta est." Epist. lib. IV. 187. In 1538, he was again solicited. During the short reign of Edward, solicitations of a similar nature appear to have been frequent." Laurence, pp. 195-99.

* This was published in 1536, under the title of "Articles Devised by the King's Highness Majesty, to stablish Christian Quietness and Unity among us, and to avoid Contentious opinions, which Articles be also approved by the Consent and Determination of the whole Clergy of this Realm." For further information, See Collier, Eccles. Hist. II. 122 fol. Burnet, Hist. Ref. I. Add, N., Fuller, C. H. XVI. B. V. 93.

the sentiment and many of the very expressions, thus borrowed, being themselves evidently derived from another source, *The Confession of Augsburg.*"

"The offices of our Church (after Edward had ascended the throne) were completely reformed, (which before had been but partially attempted,) *after the temperate System of Luther*, * * * nor were any alterations of importance, one point alone excepted, made at their subsequent revision. At the same period also, the first books of Homilies was composed, which, although *equally Lutheran*, * * * has remained without the slightest emendation to the present day. * * * Cranmer, who had never concealed the bias of his sentiments, now more openly and generally avowed them. He translated a *Lutheran Catechism*, (1547,)* * * * dedicated it to the King and recommended it in the strongest terms. * * * The opinions of the Primate (Cranmer) were at that time *perfectly Lutheran*, and although he afterward changed them in one single point, in other respects, they remained unaltered."—p. 17.

"As little reason is there to question his ability, as his personal influence, his personal influence as his attachment to Lutheranism. This latter point seems beyond all controversy."—p. 24.

"On the whole, therefore, the principles upon which our Reformation was conducted, ought not to remain in doubt. With these the mind of him to whom we are chiefly indebted for the salutary measure, was deeply impressed, and *in conformity with them* was our Liturgy drawn up and the first book of our Homilies, all that were at that time composed."

"That *our Articles* were in general, *founded upon the same principles*, I shall in the next place endeavor to prove."

"Our Reformers, indeed, had they been so disposed, might have turned their attention to the novel establishment at Geneva, which Calvin had just succeeded in forming according to his wishes, might have imitated its singular institutions and inculcated its peculiar doctrines, but this they declined, viewing it perhaps as a faint luminary, * * * this

---

*It was a Catechism which Justus Jonas had translated out of Dutch into Latin, and which was taught at Nurnberg, and first published in 1533.

they might have done, but they rather chose to give reputation to their opinions and stability to their system by adopting * * * *Lutheran sentiments* and expressing themselves in *Lutheran language.*"—p. 25.

The Archbishop begins his second Sermon in these words:

"On a former occasion I endeavored to prove, that the established doctrines of our Church, from the commencement of the Reformation to the period when our Articles first appeared, were *chiefly Lutheran ;* to point out, that the original plan was ultimately adhered to, and that in the composition of our national creed, a generel conformity with the same principles was scrupulously observed, will be the object of the present lecture."—p. 29.

"At the commencement of Edward's reign, it appears that Melanchthon was consulted upon this interesting subject. He was then alone at the head of the Lutherans, universally respected as the head of their much applauded Confession."—p. 36.

There was some delay in the completion of the Thirty-Nine Articles, owing to various causes, and the Archbishop continues, "Among other reasons which may be assigned for this delay, is it not possible that one might have been the hope of obtaining the valuable assistance of Melanchthon, who was repeatedly, in Edward's, as well as in Henry's reign, invited to fix his residence in this country?"—p. 39.

"If it be too much to conjecture that the delay was not imputable to the wish of submitting them to his personal inspection, and improving them by his consummate wisdom, the coincidence nevertheless of the time, during which they were postponed, with that of his much hoped for arrival here, cannot altogether escape observation."*

"Many of the argumentations upon points of doctrine at the same time introduced, were not only of a *Lutheran tendency*, but *couched in the very expressions of the Lutheran Creed.*"

---

* In addition to the quotations from Melanchthon's letters given above, we may add what he states to Camerarius, in September, 1535: "Ab Anglis bis vocatus sum, sed expecto TERTIAS LITERAS."—Epist. p. 722. And again, in April, 1536: "Et sic me Angli exercent, vix

"Considering them, therefore, even in their rude outline, but more particularly in their perfect state, we discover, that, in various parts of their composition, Cranmer studiously kept in view that boast of Germany and pride of the Reformation, *the Confession of Augsburg.*"

"If we, then, duly weigh the facts, which have been stated, and the consequences which seem to result from them, we shall not, perhaps, be at a loss to determine, from what quarter we are likely to collect the best materials for illustrating the Articles of our Church. We perceive, that in the first compilation many prominent passages were taken from the Augsburg and in the second place, from the Wurtemberg Confession. * * * * These were the Creeds of the Lutherans."—p. 46.

"It may then, perhaps, appear, as well from internal as external evidence, whence Cranmer derived the principles of our national Creed. * * * It may appear, that *from the Lutherans*, who had been his masters in theology, he had learned * * * almost every thing, which he deemed great and good in reformation."—p. 52.

With regard to the present Liturgy of the Church of England, the Archbishop says:

"In the year 1543, Melanchthon and Bucer drew up a Re-

---

ut RESPIRARE LICEST."—Id. 7, 738. This was when he was holding almost daily conference with the English ambassadors in Wittenberg.

For an account of his relations with the English, see Cardwell's Preface to the Liturgy of Edward VI., p. IV. note *b*.

It is interesting to know that he earnestly exhorted Cranmer to attempt an extension of the benefit beyond the confines of the English Church, to form a creed adapted to the Christian world at large. The Confession, which he had himself drawn up, would, he conceived, prove something of this description. See his Correspondence with Cranmer in Notes on Sermon II. of Archb. Laurence.

* This *Confessio Wurtembergica* was drawn up by Brentius, in the name of his Prince, Duke Christopher, who had resolved to send delegates to the Council of Trent. The Emperor had invited the Protestant States to send delegates promising them full protection. Brentius prepared the Confession for that Council, as Melanchthon had drawn up the *Confessio Saxonica* for the same purpose. Brentius' was approved by a commission of ten Swabian divines and by the city of Strasburg. It was also approved at Wittenberg as agreeing with Melanchthon's. *Schaff's Creeds &c.* I. 341.

formed Liturgy * * * for the use of the Archbishoprick of Cologne. From this work, the occasional services of our own Church, where they vary from the ancient forms, *seem principally to have been derived.* It was not however, itself original, but in a great degree borrowed from a Liturgy established at Norimberg. * * * All our offices bear evident marks of having been partly taken from this work. * * * In our Baptismal service, the resemblance between the two productions is particularly striking."—p. 144.

Proctor, in his History of the Book of Common Prayer, London, 1870, p. 41, thus speaks:

"Of all the foreigners who were engaged in the work of Reformation, Melanchthon had the greatest influence both in the general reformation of the English Church, and *in the composition* of the English Book of Common Prayer, where it differed from the mediæval Service Books."

"Melanchthon was repeatedly invited into England, and it seems probable that his opinion, supported by his character and learning, had great influence on Cranmer's mind. As early as March, 1534, he had been invited more than once; so that the attention of Henry VIII. and Cranmer had been turned towards him, *before they proceeded to* any doctrinal reformation. The formularies of faith which were put forth in the reign of Henry, are supposed to have originated in his advice. On the death of Bucer, (Feb. 28, 1551) the professorship of Divinity at Cambridge was offered to Melanchthon, and after many letters he was at last formally appointed (May, 1553.) It is, perhaps, needless to add that he never came to England. * * * *

"The first book was largely indebted to Luther, who had composed a form of service in 1533, for the use of Brandenburg and Nurnberg. This was taken by Melanchthon and Bucer as their model, when they were invited (1543) by Hermann, Prince Archbishop of Cologne, to draw up a Scriptural form of doctrine and worship for his subjects. This book contained 'Directions for the public services and administration of the Sacraments, with forms of prayer and a litany' * * * The *Litany presents many striking affinities*

---

* For a fuller account of the negotiation with Melanchthon to go to England, See Hardwick's Articles of Religion, 1859. p. 53., Strype, Eccles. Mem. I. 225–98.

with the amended English Litany of 1544. The exhortations in the Communion Service and portions of the Baptismal Services, *are mainly due to this book*, through which the influence of Luther may be traced in our Prayer Book. * * *

"They (the Thirteen Articles of 1538) not only indicate the disposition of our leading Reformers to acquiesce in the dogmatic statements which had been put forward in the Augsburg Confession, but have also a prospective bearing of still more importance, as in many ways, the ground work of articles now in use. No one can deny that the compilers of the Forty-Two Articles in the reign of Edward VI. drew largely from the Lutheran formulary of 1530."—*Ibid. 61.**.

"In the first year of the new reign (1548), he (Cranmer) had 'set forth' an English Catechism of a distinctly *Lutheran* stamp, indeed originally composed in German and translated into Latin, by Justus Jonas, the Elder, one of Luther's bosom friends."—*Ibid. 68.*

"With reference more particularly to the Sacrament of Baptism, the baptismal office of our own Reformers was derived in no small measure from Luther's *Taufbüchlein*, itself the offspring and reflexion of far older manuals."—*Ibid. 95.*

Hardwick, in Articles of Religion, Cambridge 1859, p. 13, says:

"That Confession (the Augsburg) is most intimately connected with the progress of the English Reformation; and besides the influence which it cannot fail to have exerted by its rapid circulation in our country, *it contributed* directly, *in a large degree, to the construction of the public formularies of Faith* put forward by the Church of England. The XIII. Articles, drawn up, as we shall see, in 1538, were based almost entirely on the language of the great Germanic Confession, while a similar expression of respect is no less manifest in the Articles of Edward VI., and consequently in that series which is binding now upon the conscience of the English Clergy."

---

*For a parallel between the Augsburg Confession and the XIII. Articles here spoken of, see Hardwick p. 62, seq., and for a parallel between the Augs. Confession and the Forty-Two Articles of 1553, see Appendix III., Hardwick, and for a parallel between the Augs. Conf. and the Thirty-Nine Articles, as finally agreed upon in 1571, see Annotated Prayer Book.

"A perception of this common basis in religious matters, aided by strong reasons of diplomacy, suggested the commencement of negotiations with the 'princes of the Augsburg Confession," as early as the year 1535. The first English Envoy sent among them was Robert Barnes, the victim, only five years later, of his predilection for the new opinions, &c." —*Ibid. 53.*

"But while (King) Henry was thus faltering on the subject of communion with the German League, a conference had been opened on the spot between the English delegates and a committee of Lutheran theologians. Luther himself was a party to it from the first and Melanchthon came soon afterwards (Jan. 15, 1536). The place of meeting was at Wittenberg in the house of Pontanus (Brück), the senior chancellor of Saxony, where Fox dilated on the *Lutheran tendencies of England*, and more especially of his royal master."*—*Ibid. 55.*

"Afterwards Henry begged 'the Princes of the Augsburg Confession" to send to England a legation of divines (including his peculiar favorite Melanchthon) to confer on the disputed points with a committee of English theologians. * * The whole course of the discussion was apparently determined by the plan and order of the Augsburg Confession."—*Ibid. 56—7.*

"The result of the Conference with the Germans was a 'boke' (book) which is manifestly founded on the Confession of Augsburg, often following it very closely. * * * The article on the Lord's Supper, is word for word the same." —*Ibid. 60.*

Short, in History of the Church of England, Lond. 1869, p. 165, says:

"He (Melanchthon) appears to have been consulted in 1835 concerning the Articles which were published during the next year; and the definition of *justification* there given is probably derived from the *Loci Communes* of this author: in the whole of those articles the ideas and language of the Lutheran divines have been closely followed. Many of the

---

*See Seckendorf Comment. de Lutheranismo, Lib. III. § xxxix for an account of certain articles of religion which were drawn up by the mediating party in 1535 and '36. Of those, one article has reference to the Lord's Supper, and is merely an expanded version of the Augsburg Confession.

Forty-Two Articles owe their origin to the same source, and even those which cannot be traced with certainty, exhibit a correspondence with the general opinion of the German divines."

"At the commencement of the Reformation in England, our reformers naturally cast their eyes on two standards of faith, on that of the Church of Rome, and that of the Lutheran churches, which had already discarded the errors of the papal court. The rule, then, which sound reason would seem to dictate is, that those points wherein the Church of England found it necessary to differ from that of Rome, it should refer to the opinions of the newly established churches and follow them as far as they were consistent with Scripture, and where that which was taught by the Lutherans appeared to be questionable, the Church of England should either borrow the expression of its opinions from some other reformed church, or construct its own articles directly from the word of God. In our articles are contained the great truths of Christianity * * there are many which are derived from the Lutheran Church. * * In our public services the greater part of the common Prayer Book is taken from the Roman Ritual, and some portions are borrowed from the Lutheran Church, or rather drawn up in imitation of them."

"About the same time Cranmer (1548) put forth his Catechism. This work was translated from a German Catechism used in Nuremburg, through the medium of a Latin version made by Justus Jonas.—*Ibid. 142.*

"In 1535, Fox, Heath and Barnes were sent ambassadors to Smalcalde, where proposals were made to them by the Protestant Princes, that the King should approve the Confession of Augsburg."—*Ibid. 110.*

"Whatever use he (Cranmer 1536) might have made of the Helvetic Confession in forming his own opinions, he does not appear to have introduced it into the work in which he was engaged (preparing the Forty-Two Articles), but with regard to the Augsburg Confession (1530, printed 1531 and re-published with alteration 1540), there is not only a general agreement in doctrine, but in many places the very words of the one are transferred into the other."—*Ibid. 268.**

---

*For these Forty-Two Articles in Latin and English and in paral-

"It appears that he (Archb. Parker of Canterbury, 1559) had himself been recasting the Forty-Two Articles of King Edward * * and that he added to the Articles, which had been mainly drawn from the earlier Lutheran Creeds, some new clauses obtained from the more recent confession of Wurtemberg."—*Cardwell, Synodalia, Oxford 1842, 2 vols., vol. 1, p. 35.*

"These Articles, forty-two in number, the first that were constructed by the Church of England, on the principles of the reformation, were indebted to the clear theological distinctions of Melanchthon and other reformers of Germany, and derived more especially from the Augsburg Confession. —*Ibid. vol. I., 1.*

Bishop Bull, in his Apology for the Harmony and its Author," bound with his "Examen Censarae," pp. 292, seq. Oxford 1844, says in reply to Dr. Tully:

"Dr. Tully now hastens to the Augsburg Confession. Where, in the first place, he finds fault with me because I called that the greatest of all the Reformed Confessions, not excepting even our own Anglican one. * * I only said the same thing that many learned men both of our own and foreign countries have said before me, and who also highly honored our Church. Now the Augsburg Confession is deservedly called the greatest for more than one reason. In the first place, (nor to say any thing of its most excellent and learned principal author, Phil. Melanchthon,) it was the first of all Confessions. Next, when it was published, it was approved of by the consent of almost all, if not of all the Reformed Churches, Universities and Doctors. Lastly, it is still received and held in certain kingdoms and great principalities and free States. The Doctor, moreover, is offended, because I said that the heads of our Church had followed and imitated this Confession. *But what can be clearer than this?* The first article of our Confession is taken almost word for word from the first of the Augsburg. Our second is clearly copied from the third of Augsburg. Also the sixteenth in ours * * openly imitates, towards the end, the anathemas of the eleventh in the Augsburg, as our twenty-fifth does the thirteenth in the Augsburg. Again, in our homilies how often must the attentive reader who is acquainted with Me-

---

lel columns with the Elizabethan Articles, see Hardwick Appendix III. pp. 277—333.

lanchthon's writings, *hear him speaking!* Add to which * * that Hooper of blessed memory * * was in the habit of copying long passages from Melanchthon's writings, almost word for word."

Bishop Bull, in his HARMONIA APOSTOLICA, Oxford 1842, pp. 197 seq., says, "This is the same as is meant in the Confession of Augsburg, which as it is the most noble and ancient of all the Reformed Churches, so both here and in other places, the heads of our Church *have followed it*, that whoever is ignorant of it can scarcely conceive the true meaning of our articles.

Bp. Whittingham of Maryland, in the charge to his clergy, 1849, says, "that with the Augsburg Confession their (the Thirty-Nine Articles) connection is of a nature the most intimate and direct, substantiable by superabundant evidence, both internal and circumstantial. In more than one respect, the Augsburg Confession is the source of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England and America—their prototype in form, their model in doctrine, and the very foundation of many of their expressions; while others are drawn from its derivative expositions and repetitions."

It is not inappropriate to introduce the testimony of another distinguished witness, not of the Church of England.

"The Thirty-Nine Articles were established as the law of the land under Queen Elizabeth, in 1571. * * * They are based on German Confessions of faith. Very probably the thirteen which were found among Cranmer's papers were the result of Conferences between German and English theologians, begun in Wittenberg, 1553, and continued in London in 1538, who aimed at a union of both churches. These thirteen closely follow the order of the first seventeen Articles of the Augsburg Confession and are copied nearly word for word."—*Herzog's Encyclop.*, vol I. 325, which see also for the differences between the whole Thirty-Nine Articles and the Augsburg Confession.

Schaff, in Creeds of Christendom, I. 623, says:

"The Edwardine Articles were based in part, as already observed, upon a previous draft of Thirteen Articles, which was the joint product of German and English divines, and based upon the doctrinal Articles of the Augsburg Confession. Some passages were transferred verbatim from

the Lutheran document to the Thirteen Articles, and from these to the Forty-Two (1553), and were retained in the Elizabethan revision (1563 and 1571). This will appear from the following comparison. The corresponding words are printed in italics."

After giving the comparison in parallel columns, Schaff thus concludes:

"Besides these passages, there is a close resemblance in thought, though not in language, in the statements of the doctrine of original sin and of the possibility of falling after justification. Several of the Edwardine Articles * * * were suggested by Article Seventeen of the Augsburg Confession, which is directed against the Anabaptists."

And finally, one extract from one of our own writers.—

"As to the Twenty-Five Articles, which embody the acknowledged doctrines of the Methodist Societies, they are in language and substance, so nearly identical with the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, that they must be traced through them to the same source. They are only remoter issues from the same Lutheran fountain."

"It is therefore, with justice that the Lutheran Church takes to herself the high appellation of *The Mother of Protestants.*"—*Seiss*, *Eccles. Luth.*, p. 124.

Thus, the Lutheran Origin of the Thirty-Nine Articles has been fully illustrated. Many more extracts from the writings of great divines of the Church of England, might have been given, but they only reiterate and confirm what the earlier writers have said, and, therefore, it was deemed superfluous to insert them.

NOTE.—Read at the Lutheran Diet, December 27th, 1877.

ARTICLE IV.

PRAYER-CURES.

By Rev. George Scholl, A. M., Baltimore, Md.

The subject which it is proposed to discuss in this paper, may be stated thus: Does God, in answer to prayer, cure diseases of our physical nature? The question is not whether he ever did this, but whether he does it now. The discussion, therefore, proceeds from the Christian standpoint, neither calling in question the Scriptural record of miraculous cures, nor yet God's ability to effect such cures at any time.

The question is an important one, being a part of the general subject of prayer which, as we all believe, stands or falls with Christianity.

Without positively asserting any thing on this subject, let us start out with the hypothesis that God does, at the present time, cure physical diseases in answer to the prayer of faith; and let us see what may be said both for and against this theory.

The Scriptures, from first to last, abound with instances of remarkable answers to prayer. Results are brought about that lie altogether above unaided human ability. Neither are these displays of Divine power confined, in their operations, to any particular class of objects. They operate upon both mind and matter, on organic and inorganic substances. Special judgments are sent or averted, waters are dammed up by an invisible hand, a dry rock becomes a flowing fountain, the bite of a deadly serpent is cured without the use of medicine, the strong walls of a fortified city are thrown down by an unseen power, iron is made to float like cork, rain is withheld or sent, fire is mysteriously kindled, all manner of diseases are healed, the dead are raised to life again, and, in one instance, the motion of the earth in its revolution on its axis is suspended for several hours.

In some of these cases, man is divinely instructed to ask

for the particular thing that is about to take place; in others, he asks apparently without such directions; in all, he takes some part, either in word or act. The validity of these reported intrusions of supernatural power can be maintained, only on the supposition that the governing power of the universe has its seat, not in abstract law, or a mechanically adjusted fate, but in a personal intelligence that acts from a free will; and that the direction of this governing power may, in certain cases, be delegated to such other intelligences as may have come into harmony with the Supreme Governor. This, it seems to me, is the only theory according to which we can account for those instances of supernatural manifestation recorded in the Scriptures.

Man, as a spirit, is capable of inspiration. Just as a crystal may be permeated by light, or a mass of iron by the electric current, so all the thoughts, feelings, faculties, and powers of man may be permeated and invested by the Divine Spirit. A man thus possessed is said to be Divinely illumined, sanctified, energized.

His will lies in the same plane with God's will. The desire of the one is the desire of the other. The choice of either is the choice of both. They are in harmony; they are one with each other, as the Father and the Son are one. And this is the distinction or attribute that belongs not simply to some favorite of heaven, here and there in the world's history, but to man as man, being spirit. Theoretically, then, there seems to be no good reason why the direction of the Divine energy may not be delegated to a man who is in harmony with God now, as well as in former ages.

Many, however, hold the opinion that the special object of miracles was to establish Christianity in the world, and that this having been accomplished, there is no further occasion for the display of wonder-working power. To this it might be answered, that many centuries before even a faint conception of what we understand by Christianity had dawned upon the world, such wonders were performed. What reference, for example, could the healing of Abimelech and his household, in answer to Abraham's prayer, which occurred about 2000

years B. C., have had to the establishment of Christianity? Or what connection between the founding of the Christian religion and the withholding and giving of rain, and the mysterious kindling of sacrificial fire on Mount Carmel, in answer to Elijah's prayer? Of course there is this general connection, that all display of supernatural power has a tendency, or rather the result of keeping alive a belief in the immanence of God in all things. In all ages of the world, it seems to have been one of the methods by which God reveals himself, and keeps alive, in the faith of humanity, the fact of his over-ruling power and providence. Prayer-cures, distinctly as such, according to the Bible record, extend over a period of at least 2000 years prior to the Christian era, and that is equal to one-third of the time that the human race has existed.

Then too, the teaching of Scripture on this point would leave any one, who has not a theory of his own to support, under the impression that this power was to be continued to man. It was not delegated to the Apostles only. When Christ sent forth his disciples saying, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature," he added, "And these signs shall follow them that believe, * * they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." Not the Apostles only but those also who believed on Christ through their word. The man whose eyes Christ opened said, "If *any* man be a worshiper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth;" and the inspired Apostle evidently sanctions the statement by incorporating it in his report. At any rate he does not correct it, if it is untrue.

And where can language be found that is more distinct and explicit, on any subject, than this from James: "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord:

"And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him. Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual

fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." And then, as if fearing that the reader might think that such power belonged only to a few collossal characters, he adds, "Elias was a man subject to like passions as we are, and he prayed earnestly that it might not rain: and it rained not on the earth by the space of three years and six months. And he prayed again, and the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit."

Almost 1000 years had elapsed since Elijah's prayer was so signally answered, but in answer to believing prayer, God was just as able now to send health to the diseased body, as he then was to send rain to refresh the parched earth. This *seems to be* the argument and belief of St. James.

Now, any system of interpretation that will undertake to confine this promise to the apostles and their contemporaries, or even to the more immediate successors of the Apostles, could, with equal justness, be made to similarly limit nine-tenths of all the promises and precepts of the Bible. When the Saviour says, "That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven," are we to understand that promise as referring only to the first two, or two and a half centuries of the Christian Church? No unbiased mind, it seems to me, can read the New Testament, without coming to the conclusion, that its writers mean to teach that God will hear and answer prayer in the nineteenth century of the Christian era, as well as in the first; for He is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. And why should an exception be made in the matter of praying for the sick? I can find no warrant in the Scriptures for such an exception.

But now a final and conclusive appeal, it is thought, is taken from this position, when the testimony of facts is called for. The argument in favor of the continuance of this power seems to be plausible enough; theoretically, there may be no objection and even the Scriptures seems to uphold the theory, but where, in our time, are the evidences that God does cure physical diseases in answer to prayer? It may be answered, in the first place, that those who hold the opinion that such

wonders are discontinued, have never been able to designate any definite period when they are supposed to have come to an end. Church historians, I believe, generally agree in admitting that cures and other wonders were performed as late as the third century of the Christian era, and yet those that were performed in the second and third centuries are not supported by any better testimony, than those that are claimed to have taken place at different periods, all the way down to the present. That a large number of clearly defined cases of this kind have not occurred in any given period, is no argument against the position, since the same is true of other Divine manifestations. There have been periods, and that long ones, in the history of the Christian Church, when the exercise of the Divine power in the salvation of souls was well nigh suspended. Faith had died out of the Church. Then again revival comes, as under Luther, and later under the preaching of the pietists in Germany, and under the Scotch and English reformers, Knox, Wesley, Whitfield and others. So in this case. When the great body of theologians and Christian teachers unite in the assumption that miracles have been discontinued, can it be a matter of wonder that the Church has lost its faith in the efficacy of prayer in behalf of the sick? The loss of faith is, of course, the loss of power; for even Christ based his wonder-working power on the faith of the people. In a certain section of the country, he could not do many mighty works, because of the unbelief of the people. But there is such a thing as a revival of faith, and with the revival will also come the demonstration of power.

But may it not be true, that many cases are now occurring daily in which diseases are cured and lives saved in direct answer to prayer? Is it, from the Christian stand-point, less contrary to reason to so conclude, than it is to assert that many people, by the taking of medicine, get well who otherwise would have died? What may be asserted about the medicine cure, may also be asserted about the prayer cure. Of all the sick people who take medicine; many recover, and

many die. Of all the sick people who are prayed for, many recover, and many die. This, of course, proves nothing; but who would dare to assert, that because many patients who are medically treated die, that therefore medicine never cures. And yet would such a conclusion be any less contrary to reason, than to assert that the prayer of faith never saves the sick and dying? But when a patient, being both medically treated and prayed for, recovers, how then? Which is to have the credit? In such instances, I believe, the custom is to pray that the remedies employed may be blessed to the recovery of the patient; which prayer implies that neither the remedies nor the administering authority are infallible, and so need to be supplemented by the Divine wisdom and power. The least that can be conceded, therefore, is that prayer is a factor in the sum total of the curative agency. But it may be urged that many sick are restored through medical treatment alone. This proves nothing, since it is equally true that many very sick people get well without any medical treatment; and it would be easy to show, by quotations from the highest medical authority, that it is not a settled question, even among the doctors, whether the majority of patients who recover do so by virtue of, or in spite of, their treatment. Evidently we can gather little or nothing from this field either for or against the question.

Another theory is advanced by those who are disinclined to believe in miracles at the present time. A popular commentator, whose works are perhaps read by a larger number of people in this country than those of any other, says: "There are cases where God *seems* to interpose in behalf of the righteous directly, in answer to prayer, in times of sickness, poverty, and danger,—raising them up from the borders of the grave; providing for their wants in a manner which appears to be as providential as when the ravens fed Elijah, and rescuing them from danger. There are numerous such cases which cannot well be accounted for on any other supposition than that God does directly interpose in their behalf, and show them these mercies because they are his friends. These are not miracles. The purpose to do this was a part

of the original plan when the world was made, and the prayer and the interposition are only the fulfilling of the eternal decree."

Was it then not also "a part of the original plan," that God should save the three young Hebrews in the fiery furnace, and Daniel in the lion's den? Was it any other than "the fulfilling of the eternal decree" that Lazarus should come from the grave at the call of Jesus, or the lame man stand up at the call of Peter and John?

Were these cases unexpectedly sprung on the Divine notice? I must confess that it looks somewhat suspicious, that Christian theologians should use the same argument against miracles supposed to have been wrought during the nineteen centuries that have elapsed since the introduction of Christianity, that Hume and other infidels employed to show their incredibility during the twenty or more centuries that preceded this era.

If we believe that this universe of God, in all its appointments of mind and matter, its angels, and principalities, and powers, and souls of men, as well as its trees, and rocks, is only a vast machine in which each wheel must go just so, and can go no other way even if it would, why let us say so. But I suppose people will continue to believe that they are wheels that can go right or wrong, turning this way or that, as they choose. We must either take the position that God and man are personal beings with freedom of will, who can reciprocally move upon and influence each other, or be driven to the conclusion that we are only stones built immovably into a wall, and consequently that prayer has not even the merit of a dumb bell exercise; or that we are simply wheels, and that prayer is the foreordained turning of the wheels, over the increased or diminished velocity of which we, however, have no control, and consequently that the request of the disciples, "Lord, increase our faith," was an absurd one. I incline to the opinion, however, that the God of revelation, whom Christ has taught us to address as "Our Father," is no such cast iron Deity. He may be moved by our entreaties to do differently from that which He had at first intended.

This may seem like a daring statement, but I make it with all reverence. No one can read the account of Hezekiah's sickness that was to have been unto death, the positive statement of that fact by the prophet Isaiah, Hezekiah's subsequent prayer, his sudden recovery and the addition of fifteen years to the period of his life, without coming to this conclusion. Nor can Abraham's intercession for the city of Sodom, it seems to me, be satisfactorily explained on any other supposition.

The Saviour informs the disciples that it will be even the chief glory of the Heavenly Father, that they should come into such a state of harmony with Him, that they might obtain whatever they desired simply for the asking. They are put under no limitation, save that they are to be in harmony with Him and to ask in His name. On those conditions absolute power would be safe in the hands of any man. "Whatsoever we ask," says John, "we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight."

And this has been the consciousness of all men who have been deepest in the secret of God, since the days of John and Paul. Is it for us to say, that Luther was laboring under a delusion when he said, "How often has it happened, *and still does*, that devils have been driven out in the name of Christ; also, by the calling of his name and prayer, that the sick have been healed!" Right brave and royal words, too, are these: "The devil is aware that this does not proceed out of fear in me. Duke George is not equal to one devil. If I had business at Leipzig, I would ride into Leipzig, though it rained Duke-Georges for nine days running." Evidently the old reformer had the consciousness that devils were subject to him.

The life of Wesley, too, abounds with instances that can be accounted for, only on the supposition that the world is just as open now to the influx of special divine power as ever. And what are we to make of the hundreds and thousands of cases of drunkards, who have been brought to Christ within the last year, who testify with all the positiveness of

the man whose eyes Christ opened, that He has not only saved their souls, but even taken the demon appetite out of their diseased and poisoned physical nature. Would the instantaneous extraction of the small-pox virus out of the human system be less a physical cure than this? But it is needless to multiply instances. "By a denial of the miraculous," says Christlieb, "we do not in the least escape miracles, but only have to believe in greater prodigies."

Evidently we live in a world supernaturally governed,—a world over which an infinite Intelligence broods, moulding individuals and nations into instruments for the accomplishment of his purposes in the earth. And. in as far as He is able to bring human intelligences into harmony with himself, he delegates to them the power of directing his own divine energies for the temporal and eternal well-being of the race.

ARTICLE V.

USE AND ABUSE OF DENOMINATIONALISM.*

This day, three hundred and sixty years ago, the city of Wittenberg was in commotion over, what proved to be, the birth of the Protestant Reformation. I esteem it a happy coincidence, if nothing more, that as a representative of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, it is my privilege to read a paper before the American Branch of the Evangelical Alliance, on the anniversary of the day that Martin Luther nailed his famous *ninety-five Theses* to the church door in Wittenberg. The profound significance of Luther's act was not then understood, but to it we may trace back all we enjoy in our improved Christianity and advanced civilization. It was then and there, that the blow was struck which liberated millions from the thraldom of the Papacy. Without the 31st of October, 1517, religious and civil freedom would be without a real birth-day; and had not Luther on that day

*A paper read, Oct. 31st, 1877, before the United States Evangelical Alliance at the conference held at Detroit.

done what he did, we would not, as the representatives of free Protestant Churches, be meeting in the city of Detroit, on the 31st of October, 1877.

Nothing can be farther from my thoughts than to arrogate to ourselves, as a Church, any exclusive honors of the Reformation. Luther belongs to the whole Protestant world. Nor was he the only hero of that era. But his name and his achievements entitle him, and this day, to the grateful remembrance of all the friends of evangelical religion and civil liberty.

We have met to consider some of the questions of interest to our common Christianity. We come together as members of the great Protestant family. It is fitting that we should pay this very humble tribute to the great Reformer; and as children of the Reformation, it behooves us to inquire how we are administering the estate left us, or what improvement we are making of our inheritance. Three hundred and fifty years ago, we should have been known simply as Protestants, or as the Evangelical Church: to-day we come with different names emblazoned on our banners. Protestantism has separated into a variety of denominations, and this gives rise to the question of the hour:

USE AND ABUSE OF DENOMINATIONALISM.

The topic which I am to discuss, is one of peculiar delicacy. There is hardly another subject on which Christian people are so sensitive, as that of their denominational peculiarities and interests. It is with this as it is with families. The name is an inheritance and a possession, which they feel bound to cherish and defend. Individuals will bear almost anything said against the human family more patiently, than the slightest imputation against their own family good name. We feel no special indignation against Mr. Darwin, so long as his speculations are confined to the whole family of man; we would perhaps feel somewhat differently, if he had undertaken to prove that some one of our particular families had descended from a monkey ancestry. So Christians will bear, with less disturbance of their equanimity, any thing said

against the Church, or even against Christianity, than against their own denomination. The philosophy of this is very simple, and we need not dwell upon it. What I desire to say is, that as no offence is intended to any one, so it is hoped that no offence will be taken, where none is designed, and that I will be allowed to speak with candor and freedom. It would be an affectation of charity to withhold what is believed to be the truth.

The term *denomination*, as applied to religious organizations, is very common, yet not very clearly defined. We use it as nearly synonymous with *Church*, when that term is applied to a particular body of Christians, as the Presbyterian or Methodist denomination; but we do not so commonly say the Catholic or Greek or Protestant denomination. Ordinarily we say Catholic or Greek *Church*. Common usage applies the term to designate the different divisions in the Protestant Church, which has become the very nursery of denominations. *Denominationalism*, then, signifies attachment or devotion to the interests of one's own particular Church.

We are not called upon, at this time, to discuss the abstract question of the unity of the Church of Christ, or whether the division of Protestantism into different denominations is to be considered a curse or a blessing. Ours is a far simpler task. We have to deal with facts as they exist. We are to accept these facts, and, without needless speculations about the why or the wherefore, to consider *the use and abuse of Denominationalism.*

It may not be amiss, however, in passing, to say for the benefit of those who are so seriously exercised over the divisions in the Church, and whose zeal is expended chiefly in fruitless lamentations, that these denominations in Christendom, whether right or wrong, good or evil, are quite in harmony with all the analogies in human affairs. In philosophy, from the earliest times to the present day, there have been different schools or denominations; and so in politics, science, and the fine arts. Religion forms no exception to the general rule, nor Christianity to the general rule in religion. If it be said that Christianity is divine, and that the Church is a

divine institution, we reply, they are; but they have to do with human beings, and these frail and fallible, so that we need not be surprised at the divisions or denominations among Christians. These divisions began to show themselves even in the times of the Apostles, and though sharply rebuked, the spirit could not be entirely suppressed. The divine ideal of the Church is that of one, and not many, and in the end there will be but one, but during its earthly manifestation and development, we witness divisions bearing different denominational names.

This is not offered as any apology or defence for the existence of divisions in the Church of Christ, but simply to say, that in this world of imperfection and evil, it is useless to expect to find the divine ideal of the Church perfectly realized; or to find the Church free from imperfections: and that it is worse than useless, to spend our time in fruitless complaints and lamentations, instead of doing what we can, and as we can, to advance the cause of Christ and His Church in the midst of these difficulties. We must submit to what we cannot hinder, remedy the evils within our power, and patiently endure, waiting God's own time to perfect that which concerns His Church. It is easy to find fault, to spy out real or imaginary imperfections almost everywhere, but wisdom seeks after and pursues the good. So let us do in the discussion of this subject.

I. In considering the *use* of Denominationalism, we note,

1. That of adaptation. It affords the opportunity for Christianity to adapt itself to the different tastes of individuals and peoples, so that each may accept and practice that particular form which is most acceptable, or which most commends itself to the individual judgment.

We must not be misunderstood. We do not mean to present Christianity as something with no definite or fixed character, or that may be anything or nothing, to suit the whims or fancies of men. In its essence, like its divine author, it is unchangeable. But there are things held and practiced among different denominations not essential to Christianity, or to the existence of the Christian Church. These are

largely the very things about which we differ, and which mark denominational character. They are matters of human preference, rather than of divine injunction or requirement. The whole subject of the use of liturgies and the extent of liturgical services, may be regarded as included in this statement. Some denominations take their names from their system of church polity, or external organization, as Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, Independent; others from the mode of administering an ordinance, as Baptist; but however tenaciously they may hold to their preferences, it will hardly be maintained that they are essential to Christianity or the Church, or that any one of these is the only true Church of Christ. Within the same denomination, we sometimes find existing as much diversity in faith and practice as serves to separate into different denominations.

It may be imagined that the differences in doctrine are more important, and perhaps they are; and yet most of these must be placed under the head of non-fundamental. Whatever may have been the opinions in former generations, and in the heat of controversy, when many of our Protestant denominations sprang into existence, there has been a great softening down of severe judgments, and few are disposed to-day to stand by every jot and tittle of their Confessions as essential to soundness in the faith. Calvinism and Arminianism do not sound to us just as they did some generations ago. They are now found existing peacefully in the same fold.

But these differences between denominations do afford the opportunity for the exercise of individual judgment and preference. And this, within proper limits, and while these denominations continue to exist, it is scriptural and right. No man was more unyielding, when principle was involved, than Paul; and yet he could become all things to all men. He could accommodate himself to local or national preferences, and not insist on absolute uniformity in all things and everywhere. To the Jew he could be a Jew, and to the Greek a Greek. May not the same principle of accommodation, or adaptation, apply to denominations?

Some may feel more comfortable and secure in a Church that has a bishop to watch over it, while others rejoice in their independence or freedom from any such control. A bench of elders may seem most scriptural to some, while others may claim congregational rule as apostolic and primitive. Some may prefer to be baptized, where there is "much water," while others are equally satisfied with being 'sprinkled with clean water that they may be clean.'

So long as such things are regarded as matters of preference or of individual judgment, they may be of use in affording an opportunity for the exercise of such preference. There may be evils growing out of the exercise of this freedom, as all freedom is liable to abuse, but the evils are not comparable to the destruction of religious freedom, or to a constrained uniformity. The history of the Church furnishes sad lessons of the injury done to conscience and the cause of Christ, by attempting to enforce cruel acts of conformity. No reflecting person can doubt as to the serious consequences to the cause of Christ of any attempt, at the present day, to insist on absolute agreement in all matters of faith, or of complete uniformity in religious forms and observances. The individual preference is accommodated, and thus the peace of the Church, and the progress of genuine religion subserved, by a proper use of denominationalism.

2. The stimulus afforded to free inquiry and to continued theological investigation. It is part of the divine plan that we should search diligently after the truth, prove all things, and hold fast only that which is good. Without this earnest search after the truth, there is not only no finding it, but there would be no appreciation of it when found. It is preliminary to the prizing, as well as to the finding, of true wisdom, that we 'seek her as silver, and search for her as for hid treasures.' No man ever highly prized a truth which it cost him no effort to discover or possess. Earnest, diligent inquiry is the price of truth in every department of knowledge, and pre-eminently so in regard to divine knowledge.

Freedom of inquiry, and continued investigation into the truths of God's word, are essential to the very life and health

of Christianity. Any attempt to suppress such free inquiry, would be a blow aimed at the very life of the Church. We may, perhaps, sometimes have been tempted to wonder, in the midst of theological controversy and the clashing of conflicting creeds, why God has not given us a system of doctrine, or confession of faith, that would forbid such dissensions and controversies. But a little reflection will convince us that no greater calamity could befall the Church than to have imposed on her such an infallible stereotyped creed. It would virtually end all freedom of inquiry, all earnest investigation of divine truth, and doom the human mind to abject submission or servile obedience. We should not be surprised that we have no inspired, infallible creed—and those who are anxious for such a possession, and even ready to offer their own to supply the place, do not seem aware of their folly. We thank God that the Christian Church has no inspired, infallible creed.

The difference in this respect between the Catholic and Greek Churches on the one hand, and the Protestant Church on the other, may serve to illustrate our point. In the former Churches, freedom of inquiry has been stifled by church authority, and there is a corresponding stagnation in every department of theological discussion. Their theology has become fossilized, and very little attention is given to the study of divine truth. The living, active spirit of inquiry, of search after truth, of acknowledged submission to the Bible as the fountain of revealed truth, which characterizes our Protestant Christianity, may, in part at least, be attributed to the influence of denominationalism. Each denomination, zealous for the truth it maintains, has contributed something to the general interest, and thus served to swell the current of religious inquiry and theological activity. That this is a blessing will be doubted only by those, who prefer opinion to truth, or blind submission and mental indolence to spiritual freedom and true religious life.

3. The development of clear and sharply defined yet harmonious Christian doctrine. Christianity is, in part, a doctrinal system. It has to do with the great fundamental

verities of God and the soul, Christ and redemption, the Holy Spirit and regeneration, the working of divine grace and man's eternal salvation. The Church is "the pillar and ground of the truth." The Bible does not present us with any digested and arranged system, but furnishes the material from which we are to construct a system. This is the work of theology, and in spite of all the prejudice in certain quarters, it is a most important work. Christian theologians have done for the Bible and Christianity, what scientific authors have done for the different sciences.

We all know how much conflicting opinions, even to fundamental heresies on the one side, had to do in the early Church with bringing out the great fundamental truths of Christianity. The Nicene and Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creeds, and also the Athanasian, were called forth by prevailing errors. Some of our modern Confessions had a similar origin. Denominations, only partially opposed to each other on certain minor points of doctrine, have served to bring out into clearer light and more distinct apprehension the truth involved, and at the same time to guard against perverted and one-sided views. Take the two grand divisions into which Protestantism separated at the Reformation—Lutheran and Reformed—and there can be no doubt but that these diversities have served to bring out and uphold the truth. Either alone would have been in danger of developing too much in one direction, but they have exerted a salutary check upon each other. Their main points of difference related to the Sacraments, and the divine purposes in reference to our race. At Marburg but a single point separated Luther and Zwingle. Subsequently the divergent tendencies became more marked, and these tendencies unchecked would have ended in extreme views, if not dangerous errors. On the Sacraments there has been a constant tendency to the one or the other extreme, of making them mere empty signs, or of unduly magnifying their efficacy as essential to salvation, and the certain means of its attainment. The Lutheran Church has done something in the Protestant world to preserve the Church from degenerating into low, rationalistic

views of the Sacraments, and the Reformed has done something to preserve the Church from the gross errors into which the Roman and Greek Churches have fallen. And so in regard to the divine decrees. The rigors of Calvinism have been checked, not a little, by the free spirit and more liberal theology of Lutheranism. If the one has served to uphold the sovereignty of divine grace, the other has vindicated the boundlessness of divine love and mercy. It is quite certain that the theology of the present day shows the modifying influences which have been at work in moulding its doctrines. The Protestant Theology of to-day is the most complete and harmoniously developed the Christian world has ever known, and it is still in the process of progressive im-improvement—not improvement on Bible truth, but improvement in the manner of conceiving and exhibiting the truth. There is genuine progress in theological Science, and that progress if not dependent on, has been greatly promoted by, denominational influence. As different schools in science and philosophy have stimulated inquiry and exploded false theories, so in theology have they served to detect error, and establish the truth of the Bible.

We may see this in regard to one doctrine, deemed by all evangelical Churches fundamental—the doctrine of the atonement. Especially since Anselm, this doctrine has been the subject of careful and critical investigation. Sometimes rather crude notions have been advanced, and in some Confessions views have found a place that would hardly be defended at this day. The various points of the nature, the necessity, the extent, and the completeness of the atonement have all been discussed from different points of view, as occupied by different Churches; and volumes have been written in support of the general doctrine, and particular phases of it. It would be too much to say that all churches are even now agreed upon every feature of this doctrine. But this may be said, as the result of all the discussion and comparison of divergent and sometimes conflicting opinions—the cross of Christ has become, more and more, the rallying point and centre of union among all evangelical Churches.

4. The quickening of zeal and the promotion of active efforts in the extension of Christ's Kingdom. Doubtless Christians should always be actuated by the purest and most exalted motives. The love of Christ as a constraining power should be sufficient and all controlling. But doubtless this is not always the case. They are often moved by subordinate and less worthy motives. The apostle tells us that "some indeed preach Christ of envy and strife," but so far from finding fault, he accepts the good, and says, "notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence, or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice." The contention between Paul and Barnabas, and their separation, it is thought was overruled to the furtherance of the Gospel, by each striving to do his utmost in his separate field of labor.

So now, a healthy rivalry between different denominations may aid, in various ways, in the advancement of the interests of Christ's kingdom. There may be a quickening of zeal in laboring for the conversion of souls, and gathering them into Christian congregations. There is a denominational pride in the erection of churches, in the preaching of the Gospel, and in the whole work of advancing the denominational interest in the kingdom of Christ. Like the corps in a grand army, each denomination is jealous of its own reputation, and ambitious of distinction in the grand success. It can hardly be doubted that more money is raised to sustain the Gospel at home, and to carry it to the perishing in heathen lands, through denominatioual influence, than if no such denominational divisions existed. One Church is stimulated by the activity and zeal of another. We do not like to be outdone. Denominational zeal has showed itself in founding and sustaining educational institutions—Colleges and Theological Seminaries—and carrying forward the work of sound Christian culture. Whatever may be true of the future, we may safely say of the past, that we are largely indebted to the various Christian denominations for our higher education. American Colleges and Theological Seminaries are largely the outgrowth of our American Churches. It is

quite fashionable now in some quarters to decry such institutions, but it is the cry of ingratitude towards the noblest and best of benefactors.

Whilst they that compare themselves with themselves, instead of measuring by the high standard of God's word, may not be very wise, still they may be doing more and better than they would without any such incentive to action. The apostle does not hesitate to stir up some of the Churches to benevolence and activity, by setting before them the example of others, which were distinguishing themselves by their zeal and good works.

Other uses of denominationalism might be mentioned, but the reasonable limits to which these discussions should be restricted forbids too extended an enumeration, as well as any very lengthy consideration of the points which have been presented. It is believed that those now stated are entirely legitimate, and not necessarily inconsistent with the true unity and harmonious working of the Church of the Redeemer. They do not involve any conflicts in the service of the Master, or marshalling in hostile array the forces enlisted in a common cause.

The picture of a time when we shall all be one, and with united front advance to the pulling down of the strong holds of Satan, may be attractive and cheering to the Christian heart, but till then, each corps and regiment, vieing with the other in the contest with sin and Satan, should perform valiantly its part in pushing forward the conquests of our Divine Leader.

II. We must now turn to the other side of this subject. To most minds the *abuse* of denominationalism is more patent than the *use*. Indeed some regard all denominationalism as an abuse—as productive of evil and evil only. They are so impressed with the evils of division in the Church of Christ, of the repulsive features of sectarianism, and having withal a particular theory of the unity of the Church, that they can find no place for what others may be inclined to regard as a lawful use of denominationalism. They consider it a solemn duty to declaim against the existence of denominations. The

danger is, as facts abundantly illustrate, that those who are so bitterly opposed to what they commonly style sects, as to be unwilling to tolerate their existence, become themselves the most intensely sectarian. What they are really opposed to, is all denominations except their own, and the unity they desire, is a unity of which they are to be the centre and transforming soul.

And yet patent as the *abuse* is, there is more difficulty in clearly and satisfactorily setting it forth, than there is in setting forth the other side. We more readily dwell upon the beauties of a picture than upon its deformities, and especially when these deformities serve to remind us of similar defects of our own. Almost everything that some will regard as an abuse, others will regard as touching upon the sacred rights of conscience, or as essential to the full enjoyment of religious freedom. It is all very well, so long as it does not intere with our own particular denomination, but if the abuse be one that requires some sacrifice of prejudice or interest on our part, we are slow to see that it is an abuse. It will not be a matter of great surprise or disappointment, if we fail to make much impression, where the abuse has been so long cherished, as a matter of religious principle. Prejudice is slow to surrender its dominion, and few sacrifices are more difficult to make than to give up long cherished opinions.

We may be allowed to say, before we go further, that we believe there has been an abuse of denominationalism—a most serious abuse—and that this abuse is one of the weaknesses of our modern Protestantism, often bringing reproach upon the good name of religion, and greatly retarding the progress of Christ's kingdom. It would be easy to dwell upon specific kinds of abuse and to furnish numerous illustrations—but we prefer to confine ourselves to a few general statements, leaving to each one to make specific applications. And yet we do not mean to be so general, that the abuse will escape detection, and we all flatter ourselves that we are verily not guilty in this matter. We note,

1. When denominationalism destroys or hinders true, hearty fellowship among Christians. The disciples of Christ are,

or should be, one. It is needless to quote any of the very numerous passages in the New Testament setting forth the oneness of believers in Christ. The whole conception of the Church and of Christianity, as exhibited in the New Testament, involves this unity. Nothing could be more foreign or opposed to the idea of the Church of Christ—with "one Lord, one faith, and one baptism"—than a number of opposing sects, having little or no true fellowship with one another, but contending as rival parties, and ready to "bite and devour one another."

"*I believe in the Holy Catholic Church—the Communion of saints*," has been the professed faith of the Church universal, and in all ages. Different explanations may be given of the meaning, and some may endeavor so to explain it as to suit their own exclusiveness. To them the Church may mean some ideal, or invisible body, in which is to exist this "communion of saints;" and they may try to reconcile such communion with the absolute denial of it in the visible Church. We have no time now to discuss theories of the Church, or to determine the precise meaning of this article in the Apostles' Creed, but we take it, that *the Holy Catholic Church* does not wholly exclude Christ's visible Church here on the earth. He has such a Church, and every true, particular Church, or denomination, is a part of that Church. To deny this would be to deny our common Christianity. In this *Holy Catholic Church* there is to be fellowship among the members, and if denominationalism comes in to hinder or destroy it, it is an abuse.

How far this is true among Protestant denominations-there will no doubt be difference of opinion, as well as in regard to the remedy which should be applied. We are simply to point out the abuse, and must leave to others to say what should be done. We must be free, however, to utter the strong conviction, that if denominationalism is carried to the extent of fencing about the Lord's table, or of impugning the validity of each others ministry and sacraments, so as to leave only a hollow pretence or superficial show of true fel-

lowship, it is a flagrant abuse; and this, whether it be among denominations bearing entirely different names, or as, is sometimes the case, among different parties bearing the same name. It will not do to take refuge in some mysterious, hidden, invisible fellowship, while the outward bond of union is not only neglected, but is openly and avowedly disowned and repudiated. True Christian fellowship—"the communion of saints"—may be spiritual and invisible; and there may be outward fellowship, where the inward and true is utterly wanting; but that there can be hearty, sincere, and genuine fellowship between those who deny each others ministry or sacraments, and who refuse a mutual recognition in the Master's house, it is hard to conceive. Or that there can be true fellowship in some invisible Church, while it is ignored in the visible, it is equally hard to believe. The principle of the apostle's language, if not the very words, may be applied here. "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" How can there be brotherly love and fellowship in some invisible Church, when they are set at nought in the Church visible, the Church to which we all profess to belong? Those other words of the apostle have an unmistakable meaning and application in this connection. "My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth."

We know very well what will be said in reply to this. Excuses are readily found to cover over the palpable inconsistencies between our professions and our practice. There is a professed recognition of each others' Christianity, a commingling, to some extent, in public meetings and in social Christian intercourse, and yet a positive refusal to recognize each other just where recognition has real signification and value. Pulpit is erected against pulpit, and altar against altar, and instead of being, as the apostle says, "all baptized into one body," they are baptized into so many different bodies; and instead of 'the many being one bread, one body, and all partakers of that one bread,' there is an unwillingness to commune together at the Lord's table.

And for this, let it not be forgotten, there is no express

warrant in God's word, but it is all a matter of inference or conclusion from some disputed premise or doubtful interpretation of scripture; over against which may be set the whole spirit of the New Testament and the very genius of Christianity. To the pleas for such an anomalous practice, we may reply in the words of Stillingfleet: "What charter hath Christ given the Church to bind men up to, more than Himself hath done? or to exclude those from her society who may be admitted into heaven? Will Christ ever thank men, at the great day, for keeping such out from communion with His Church, whom He will vouchsafe not only crowns of glory to, but it may be *aureolæ* too, if there be any such things there? The great commission the apostles were sent out with, was *only to teach what Christ had commanded them.* Not the least intimation of any power given them to impose or require anything beyond what Himself had spoken to them, or they were directed to by the immediate guidance of the Spirit of God."

So long as there is an unwillingness among evangelical Churches to give full credit to each others' ministry and membership, there is a virtual unchurching of one another, and no interchange of friendly salutations across the impassable gulf, or honied words of mutual confidence and good will can cover the lack of charity and true Christian fellowship. The undisguised fact stands out, that denominationalism is dearer than the Church, and that true Christian fellowship is sacrificed on the altar of partisan zeal.

2. The magnifying of a denominational peculiarity above the great fundamental doctrines of Christianity; so that instead of Christ being preached, it is some peculiarity of Church or Creed that is constantly presented, and, as a consequence, instead of a united Church, the world is called to behold a collection of numberless sects. True unity in the Church of Christ may be no more inconsistent with variety and diversity than in the natural world. We admire the wonderful variety, blended in beautiful harmony, in the external world around us. From the grains of sand on the sea shore, or the leaves of the forest, to the blazing suns in the

heavens, no two are absolutely alike. Infinite variety marks all the works of God. We should not expect it to be altogether otherwise in the Church which He has founded. Even those Churches that pretend to complete unity—unity of faith, and organization, and worship—are as far from true internal unity, as those that make no such pretence. The Roman Catholic Church includes parties as diverse and opposed to each other, as the different denominations among Protestants.

Yet among Protestant denominations there has been not a little preaching that savored more of sect than of Christ. To make a proselyte has been esteemed a greater achievement than to make a Christian. The peculiarities of a denomination have been urged with more zeal than the cross of Christ. Those who needed to be enlightened by the simple truth of the Gospel, have been confused and led astray by the traditions of men. We hold in abomination the Romish doctrine of tradition; and yet are guilty too often of the same folly and wickedness. Our denominational traditions are put along side of or above the word of God. No Protestant denomination may be willing to admit this as true in its own case, but all would stand convicted before an impartial tribunal, as more or less guilty of the charge. We would not magnify the evil, or intimate that this is the whole or the general character of Protestant preaching; but that it has an element of this kind, leading to false estimates of the importance of our peculiarities, and exalting a minor difference above a fundamental agreement.

And when such diversities cause divisions that cannot or will not harmonize, but oppose and resist each other, or when the points of difference are so magnified above the points of agreement, that the former have more power to repel and separate than the latter have to attract and unite, then there is an abuse of denominationalism. So long as evangelical Churches can agree to disagree, and mutually recognize each other as true Churches of Jesus Christ—branches growing out of the same vine—there may be no destruction of the essential unity of the Church of Christ. But if denomina-

tional peculiarities are lifted high above the common faith, and differences in church polity, or the administration of ordinances, be deemed of more importance than brotherly charity—'the keeping of the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace'—then the spirit of sect is stronger than the spirit of union, denominationalism becomes dearer than the Church of Christ, and the body of Christ is rent asunder. We may talk as much as we please about conscience, and loyalty to our convictions, and obedience to the authority of the Master, it is an abuse of denominationalism. Conscience, and honesty, and loyalty to convictions are not the peculiar possession of one denomination, to the exclusion of others; and too often such terms are used as a convenient pretext for prejudice, bigotry or intolerance. The apostle found such uncharitableness in his day, but he says, "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own Master he standeth or falleth. * * Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also received us to the glory of God."

Of course the differences must not involve fundamental doctrines—such as divided the orthodox and Arians, or other heretical parties, in the early Church; or such as now divide evangelical denominations and those who "deny the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ." When we have to do with such, the rule is plain. "If there come unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your houses, neither bid him God speed." * * If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." This admits of no treacherous compromise. The Gospel of Christ must not be adulterated or bartered away. But do any of the recognized evangelical Churches preach "another Gospel?" If not, such language can have no application to them, and should not be perverted to countenance an opposite error.

3. When denominationalism instead of promoting the cause of Christ, in the conversion of souls and the extension of His kingdom, throws obstacles in the way, and hinders the progress of the Gospel. This is a point that cannot fail to arrest the attention of the least reflecting observer. There

is a vast expenditure of time and labor and money, which yields little or nothing, just because it is directed in the interest of denominationalism, and not in the interest of Christ. Instead of "*peace on earth and good will among men*," rival interests awaken jealousies, and envyings, leading to discord and strife and bitter animosities. The strength that should be expended in the great work of saving souls, and filling this world with the knowledge and glory of God, is too often expended where it retards rather than advances the cause of the Divine Redeemer. It would be difficult to present an overdrawn picture of the evils resulting from the jarring conflicts of denominational interests, or of the injury done in this respect to the cause of Christ, by what must be regarded as an abuse of denominationalism. Especially in our own land—the boasted abode of religious freedom—is the abuse manifest, threatening frequently the very existence of the Church in some communities, and almost everywhere dividing and weakening the forces that should be united in a common cause. No worldly interest could prosper under such management, and it may be truly said in this respect, as in some others, "the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light."

In our large cities, not unfrequently, quite a number of churches are crowded into one locality, supposed by each denomination to be the most eligible, while vast thousands are given over to little better than heathenish ignorance and degradation. Denominations vie with each other in building costly churches for the rich, but what has become of Christ's own conclusive argument to silence doubt, and prove that He is indeed the Saviour that was to come—"*unto the poor the Gospel is preached:*" In towns, and villages, and country neighborhoods, we find ministers of the Gospel preaching sometimes to less than a score of hearers, because the population is divided into so many religious parties. With scarcely people enough to claim the services of one man, half a dozen ministers of Christ are dividing their time among them, carefully watching each other's movements, and alarmed at any success, unless it be their own. Would that this were less

true than it is, or that the abuse were exaggerated. But it is a sad truth—and to us, one of the saddest in the whole aspect of our modern Protestantism. We are, to some extent, a house divided against itself, and must suffer, to a corresponding degree, the consequences. While this condition of things lasts, we cannot expect the rapid growth of the Church, or the conversion of the world to Christ. The prayer of the Saviour, when about to pour out His soul upon the cross, waits to be answered: "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

I have not felt called upon, in the duty assigned me, to discuss the remedy for this abuse. But may I not, in conclusion, suggest that we owe it to ourselves as Christian Churches, we owe it to the world that needs and waits for the Gospel, and above all, that we owe it to our common Lord, who has given Himself for the salvation of the world, to do something to correct our *abuses*, and not to frustrate the grace of God?

ARTICLE VI.

INTERPRETATION OF PHILIPPIANS II. 6, 7.

Rev. H. Louis Baugher, A. M., Professor in Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.

"Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." So King James' Version of the Bible renders the following:

Ὅς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος.

The commentators with one consent call this passage of Scripture difficult. They do not show the same unanimity in their explanations of it. In view of all that has been

written thereon by men eminent in the interpretation of Scripture, we do not expect to say anything new, or bring any additional learning to the elucidation of this passage. Rather may we hope to call the attention of the readers of the REVIEW to that interpretation which seems to us best to harmonize with the original text and the context, especially as that view differs from the one set forth in the translation given above, and makes quite a different impression from that produced by our common English Version.

The first question that arises respects the *subject* of the statement here made by Paul to the Philippians What is the antecedent of the "who" with which verse 6 opens? Plainly the grammatical antecedent is "Christ Jesus" of the preceding verse, which reads, "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." But does this mean the "historical Christ," born in Bethlehem, or the Logos that "was in the beginning with God," and "was God" and *afterwards* "became flesh?" Evidently the scope of the whole passage from ver. 6 to ver. 11 includes all three states of the one person spoken of, pre-incarnate, incarnate, and glorified. He "took upon him the form of a servant," but evidently was in some *other* form before this, and that is called in verse 6 "the form of God," and *after* this he was "highly exalted" to a Kingship, which he did not have before. As "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and forever," we find no difficulty in finding him spoken of, in one grammatical period, in reference to three several states or conditions that followed one upon the other but left him always *the same person*, the second person in the adorable Trinity, known to us as "Jesus Christ." It is just the *contrast* brought out in the *several states or conditions* of the subject spoken of that makes him the highest example of that self-abnegation and seeking after others' good which the apostle is seeking to inculcate upon the Philippians.

It was when this person subsisted (*ὑπάρχων*) "in the form of God" that he had the thought (*ἡγήσατο,* aorist,) of which the writer speaks. "Form" is an exact rendering of *μορφή,* and is a plain word, ordinarily used: but when applied to

the invisible, to spirit, to God, there may at first seem to be an incongruity. Still we may not depart from the true meaning of the word. It does not mean the same as *οὐσία* or *φύσις*, although it may, and in this case certainly does, *imply* these, just as a shadow assumes the nearness of a substance of which it is the figure. We cannot conceive of this "form;" but it was something external, just as its antithesis, "the form of a servant" (*μορφὴν δούλου*), was. Though inconceivable by us, this "form" may be illustrated by other words, as, *e. g.*, in Col. 1 : 15, where this same person is called "the image (*εἰκών*) of the invisible God," and, similarly, in 2 Cor. 4 : 4, and, in Heb. 1 : 3, "the brightness (*ἀπαύγασμα*, reflection, effulgence) of God's glory, and the express image (*χαρακτήρ*, impress, stamp, figure, character) of his person (*ὑποστάσεως*)." Now it was *when* he was "in the form of God" and *although* he was "in the form of God," that he "emptied himself" (*ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε*) of this glory by assuming the contrasted "form of a servant" and being made "in the likeness of men." He laid aside God's likeness to take up man's likeness, never, however, having laid aside the divine *nature* (*οὐσία, φύσις*). He could have two natures in the same person, but not two *forms* at the same time. Jesus Christ could say to the Jews, (John 5 : 37), "Ye have neither heard his (the Father's) voice at any time nor seen his shape (*εἶδος*)," as "No man hath seen God at any time" (1 John 4 : 12), and yet could say to Philip (John 14 : 9), "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." Mortal eye could not endure to look upon "the form of God," but might see God when he had emptied himself and taken on "the form of a servant." The "glory" which men saw in Jesus (John 1 : 14), and which he manifested in and by his works (John 2 : 11) must not be confounded with the glory which he had with the Father before the world was (John 17 : 5) or be taken for the "form of God," which had then been laid aside.

Now the mind of the pre-incarnate Christ came to a conclusion, made a decision, "thought" (*ἡγήσατο*), in connection with the divine plan of redemption, that the condition be-

longing to his being in the form of God, viz., his being "equal with God," the glory and majesty of his equality with the Father, was not a something to be seized and held on to in self-enjoyment, an object of grasping ambition, but was willing to make himself "of no reputation," to lay that form and glory aside by assuming human form and stepping from the Creator's to the creature's place. "The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world;" yet he became that Saviour voluntarily, and said, "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God!" It was in consequence of this thought or decision that he "emptied himself" of the form of God and its glory when he "was made in the likeness of men." The *ἀλλά* clause is the counterpart of the *οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο* clause, and expresses in a positive form what the other expresses negatively.

It is generally agreed that the *τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ* is very nearly identical with the *μορφὴ θεοῦ*, the former, perhaps, referring more closely to the continuance of the state indicated by the latter. But it is not agreed that we are authorized to render *ἁρπαγμόν* as we have done, making it almost equivalent to a verbal in *-τος*. Nouns in *-μος* do regularly and properly represent the action of the verb from which they are derived, and sometimes the actor. Thus *σεισμός* means *a shaking*, and *ποτμός, a falling;* and similarly *ἁρπαγμός* would mean the robbing, *i. e., an act of robbery.* So Meyer, with many of the older commentators and the authorized Version. The clause would thus mean—He thought his being equal with God no act of robbery, no seizure of what did not belong to him, no usurpation; *and yet* he was willing to lay it aside for man's sake. This is the impression of the sense of the passage made upon ordinary English readers. It is not an *erroneous* one, certainly. But the rendering and interpretation we have given is clearer and far better suits the context, in which the apostle is advocating a putting away of "vainglory" and a cultivation of "lowliness of mind," a looking "on the things of others" for their advantange, in contrast with the selfish looking of "every man on his own things," that self-seeking which characterizes the natural heart: and he exemplifies the spirit he is inculcating

by reference to that perfect example of Jesus Christ, who, being in form and condition equal with the Father, did not think that glorious estate a thing to be grasped and held on to in selfish enjoyment, but decided to empty himself of it and stoop to man's low condition, that he might redeem him. So Paul calls on the Philippians, and the Spirit urges Christians, to be willing to make sacrifices for others' good, to bless and save by imitating the great Saviour of mankind.

Now is there anything in the law of the language forbidding such a rendering? Donaldson, in "The New Cratylus," commenting on nouns in *-μος*, holds that, though these are properly abstract, denoting the act, yet there are cases in which they are practically equivalent to the concrete, denoting the result of the act. He says, "Such, for example, is the true explanation of the phrase, Phil. 2 : 6, *οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ*, 'he did not think that the being equal with God was an object of eager desire,' where some would expect *ἅρπαγμα*." He, further, instances *δόσις*, whose termination is quite as abstract as that in *-μος*, as having become fixed in our English "dose," and meaning the *thing given* rather more than the *act* of giving; and *χρησμός* as meaning the "oracle" rather than the act of giving it, and *θεσμός* as the "law" rather than the act of giving the law. The word *ἁρπαγμός* is very rare, occurring only once in the Scriptures, and once in profane writers. Liddell and Scott render it in the place we are considering, *a matter of robbery.* Van Hengel, in a full examination of the word, adheres to the sense its termination indicates, but thinks it is used by metonyme for *res arripienda*, and cannot mean *res rapta* or *praeda.* Wieseler, agreeing with Van Hengel, translates, "He did not consider the being equal with God to be a thing that he must seize for himself."

Lightfoot says, "The more usual form of the word is *ἅρπαγμα*, which properly signifies 'a piece of plunder,' but especially with such verbs as *ἡγεῖσθαι, ποιεῖσθαι, νομίζειν, etc.*, is employed like *ἕρμαιον, εὕρημα*, to denote a highly prized possession, an unexpected gain." After adducing examples he says, "It appears then from these writers that

ἅρπαγμα ἡγεῖσθαι frequently signifies nothing more than 'to clutch greedily,' 'prize highly,' 'to set store by,' the idea of plunder or robbery having passed out of sight. The form ἁρπαγμός, however, presents a greater difficulty; for neither analogy nor usage is decisive as to its meaning; (1) The termination -μος indeed denotes primarily the *process*, so that ἁρπαγμός would be 'an act of plundering.' But as a matter of fact substantives in -μος are frequently used to describe a concrete thing, *e. g.*, θεσμός, χρησμός, φραγμός, *etc.* (2) And again the particular word ἁρπαγμος occurs so rarely that usage cannot be considered decisive. Under these circumstances we may, in choosing between the two senses of the word ἁρπαγμός, fairly assign to it here the one which best suits the context. The meaning adopted above satisfies this condition: '*Though* He pre-existed in the form of God, yet He did not look upon equality with God as a prize which must not slip from His grasp; *but* He emptied Himself, divested Himself, taking upon Him the form of a slave.' The idea is the same as in 2 Cor. 8 : 9, δι' ὑμᾶς ἐπτώχευσεν πλούσιος ὤν. The other rendering (adopted by the A. V.), 'thought it not robbery to be equal with God,' disconnects this clause from its context.". Ellicott, Eadie and other modern commentators explain in like manner. Alford is not very clear, yet his view is not contrary to the one we have given.

In this short examination of this passage of Scripture we have taken no notice of the history of its interpretation or of its doctrinal teachings, satisfied to attain and substantiate a rendering which we consider the best suited to the context and, at the same time, consistent with the laws of the language. As at the beginning we quoted King James' Version, so we will close with Bishop Ellicott's translation which is based on the views we have presented: "Who, though existing in the form of God, esteemed not His being on an equality with God a prize to be seized on, but emptied Himself, taking upon Him the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men."

ARTICLE VII.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

AMERICAN.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*The Pilgrim Psalms,* an Exposition of the Songs of Degrees, by Rev. Samuel Cox, author of "The Book of Ruth," etc., with an Introduction by Marvin R. Vincent, D. D.; *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Corinthians*, by H. A. W. Meyer, Th. D., vol. I. First Epistle Cor. I—XIII., translated from 5th ed. of the German by Rev. D. D. Bannerman; *The Book of Job*, with Notes, Critical, Explanatory and Practical, designed for both Pastor and People, with a new translation appended, by Rev. Henry Cowles, D. D.; *The Beginnings of Christianity*, with a View of the State of the Roman World at the Birth of Christ, by Rev. Prof. Geo. P. Fisher; *Studies in the New Testament*, by F. Godet, D. D.; *At Eventide*, by Rev. N. Adams, D. D.; *Theism*, by Robert Flint, D. D., (Baird Lecture, 1876); *Transcendentalism*, with Preludes on Current Events,—Boston Monday Lectures, by Joseph Cook; *Brighter than the Sun*, or Christ the Light of the World—a Life of our Lord for the Young, by J. R. Macduff, D. D., with illus. by A. Rowan; *Some Aspects of the Christian Ideal*, Sermons by Rev. L. Campbell, LL. D.; *The Life and Work of Christ*, by Cunningham Geike, D. D., 2 vols. illus.; *Christ in the Christian Year*, and in the Life of Man, Sermons by Rev. F. D. Huntington, D. D.; *Revivals of Religion*, by Rev. Jas. Porter, D. D.; *Theological Essays*, by Wm. G. T. Shedd.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*A Vocabulary of the Philosophical Sciences*, (including the Vocabulary of Philosophy, Mental, Moral, and Metaphysical, by Wm. Flemming, D. D., Prof. of Moral Philos. Univ. of Glasgow, from the 2d ed. 1860, and the 3d 1876, ed. by H. Calderwood, LL. D.), by Chas. P. Krauth, S. T. D., LL. D.; *Biology*, with Preludes on Current Events,—Boston Monday-Lectures, by Joseph Cook,—with 3 col. plates; *A Miracle in Stone*, or the Great Pyramid of Egypt, by Joseph A. Seiss, D. D.; *Physiological Æsthetics*, by Grant Allen, B. A.; *The Final Philosophy*, or System of Perfectible Knowledge issuing from the Harmony of Science and Religion, by Charles W. Shields, D. D.; *Faith and Philosophy*, or Discourses and Essays, by H. B. Smith, D. D., LL. D., ed. with Introduction by Dr. Geo. L. Prentiss; *Political Science*, or the State, Theoretically and Practically Considered, by T. D. Woolsey, 2 vols.

BIOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL.—*Thoreau*, His Life and Aims, a

Study, by H. A. Page; *Discoveries and Researches* on the Sites of Ancient Mycenæ and Tiryns, by Dr. H. Schliemann, with Introduction by the Hon. W. E. Gladstone, with maps, plates, views, etc.; *The Protestant Queen of Navarre*, the Mother of the Bourbons, by Virginia F. Townsend.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Law for the Masses*, for Every-day Use, by Truman Hastings, Esq., Counsellor, etc.; *The Enchanted Moccasins*, and other Legends of the American Indians, compiled from original sources, by Cornelius Mathews; *Monday-Chats*, by C. A. Sainte-Beuve, selected and translated from the "Causeries du Lundi," with an Introductory Essay on the life and writings of Sainte-Beuve, by Wm. Mathews, LL. D.; *The Mythology of Greece and Rome*, with special reference to its use in Art—a Class-book for the Classical and Art Schools, from the German of O. Seemann, ed. by G. H. Bianchi, illustr.; *Switzerland and the Swiss*, Sketches of the Country and its Famous Men, by the author of "The Knights of the Frozen Sea;" *Egypt as it Is*, by J. C. McCoan; *Alcohol and the State*, a Discussion of the Problem of Law, as applied to the Liquor Traffic, by Robert C. Pitman, LL. D., Associate Justice of Superior Court of Massachusetts; *Pottery and Porcelain of all Times and Nations*, with Tables of Factory and Artists' Marks, for the use of collectors, by Wm. C. Prime, LL. D., illus.; *The Khedive's Egypt*, or the Old House of Bondage under New Masters, by Edwin de Leon, illus.; *From Egypt to Japan*, by Henry M. Field, D. D.; *Echoes from Mist-Land*, or the Nibelungen Lay revealed to Lovers of Romance and Chivalry, by Auber Forrestier.

BRITISH.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, by J. A. Beet; *Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek Testament*, by Rev. E. W. Bullinger; *National Christianity*, or Cæsarism and Clericalism, by Rev. J. B. Heard; *Not Tradition but Scripture*, by P. N. Shuttleworth; *The Jewish Messiah*, by J. Drummond; *The Hebrew and Christian Records*, 2 vols. by Dr. Giles; *The History of Confirmation*, by W. Jackson.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*The Prehistoric Use of Iron and Steel*, by St. John V. Day.

GERMAN.

BIBLICAL.—Many practical expositions of books of Scripture have recently appeared. Most of them are the result of exegetical lectures to congregations. The exposition of Isaiah, in this way, is quite an undertaking, but it has been done by Rev. Dr. F. W. Weber, the successor of the well known Loehe. These expositions are published in a volume of 584 pp.

Meditations on the Epistle to the Hebrews, by Rev. K. Williger. 188

pp. The origin of this book is similar to the preceding, except that instead of the usual expository method the author seeks to lead his hearers into the depths of the Epistle by means of meditations. It is therefore less a verbal exegesis than a contemplation of the thoughts of the book.

Sketches of Discourses on the Pastoral Epistles, by Prof. Dr. Rothe. 2 vols. 390 and 418 pp. Rothe is best known as a speculative theologian, especially as the author of a very profound work on Ethics. In these volumes, however, we see him as a more practical theologian. The sketches belong to the earlier period of his career as a theological professor. They were prepared from 1832–1837, and were used for evening services at the Seminary in Wittenberg. They reveal the author's deep insight into Scripture and his rich Christian experience.

Rev. H. Krummacher gives an exposition of the *Epistle to the Romans* in sermons. 542 pp.

A work of a more learned character is *The Commentary to the Book of Daniel by the Holy Hippolytus*, by Dr. O. Bardenhewer. 107 pp. It is a critical investigation into the character of the Commentary of Hippolytus.

Historical.—The tenth edition of Hase's *Church History* has appeared. 774 pp. The first edition was published in 1834. The second edition of Dr. Brück's *Church History* has been published. 894 pp. Its author is a Roman Catholic Professor. Protestant historians are largely ignored. How little he is able to do justice to Protestantism may be inferred from the fact that he declares that the Reformation led to a decline in the sciences!

Practical.—Two very important works in the department of practical theology have appeared. One is the *System of Practical Theology*, by Prof. Dr. Zezschwitz. 2 parts, 472 pp. The author is well known in Germany by his learned works on Catechetics. In his system of Practical Theology the first part treats of Principles, the second of Cultus in relation to the word, sacrament, prayer, and liturgy. The other important work on the same subject is by Dr. Harnack. First vol. 2 parts. 635 pp. The first part contains the Introduction and the Principles. The second gives the history and theory of Cultus.

Miscellaneous.—The conflict of the German Empire with the Pope has given rise to a rich literature on the subject of the Papacy. Among works on this subject we notice the following:

The Papacy in its gradual development to the present time. 230 pp. *The Mechanism of the Vatican Religion*, by Prof. Dr. J. Friedrich. 2d ed. 72 pp. *The Vatican Dogma of the universal Episcopacy and of the Infallibility of the Pope*, By Prof. Dr. J. Langen. 102 pp. *The Doctrine and Life of the Roman Catholic Church.* By Rev. A. Lichtenstein. 156 pp.

Dr. E. Spiess has written a work on the *History of the Doctrine of a Future Life.* 615 pp. He gives the views of the different nations respecting this doctrine. The result of the author's investigation is the view that all nations have some idea of an existence beyond death.

Rev. L. Striebitz has prepared a book on the *History of Preaching in the Evangelical Church from Mosheim till the present time.* 721 pp. Special attention is given to the period since the death of Schleiermacher.

J. H. W. S.

ARTICLE VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. Prepared by the Rev. John McClintock, D. D., and James Strong, S. T. D. Vol. VII. New—Pes. pp. vi., 1003. 1877.

This *seventh volume* of this great work carries it forward into the middle of the letter P., closing with the subject *Pestle.* The work is too well known to scholars to require extended criticism, or special commendation. It may be safely said that it improves as it progresses, and this volume bears evidence of care and labor in its preparation. It contains nearly one thousand—998—articles, has had the labor of more than forty contributors, and is illustrated by more than two hundred and fifty wood-cuts, many of them aiding very materially in understanding the subjects. There also accompanies this volume a finely colored map of Palestine, with a plan of Jerusalem and its environs, unsurpassed by anything of the kind we have seen. The map has been prepared under the immediate direction of the editor, Dr. Strong, whose personal observations and researches have been employed, along with the most authentic sources of information, thus furnishing the best guarantee for correctness and accuracy. Among the contributors, are some of the leading scholars of this country, with a number from the old world. The articles, of course, differ very greatly in length and value. Many of them must be on subjects of comparatively little importance, but not a few discuss topics of greatest interest, and would make clever volumes of themselves. It is proper, however, to say, that some of the longest articles make no claim to originality, the authors acknowledging that they are chiefly compiled from the previous works of Smith, Kitto, Fairbairn and others. But what is wanting in such a work, is not originality so much as reliable information ; and it is better to furnish such matter from other standard works than to give inferior material. This valu-

able Cyclopædia is steadily advancing towards completion, and we are informed that "should no unforeseen hindrance occur, the three remaining volumes necessary to complete the Alphabet may be expected at intervals of about one year each." *Faxit Deus.*

The Origin of the World, according to Revelation and Science. By J. W. Dawson, LL. D., F. R. S., F. G. S., Principal and Vice Chancellor of McGill University, Montreal; author of "Acadian Geology," "The story of the Earth and Man," "Life's Dawn on Earth," etc. pp. 438—1877.

This volume has a somewhat pretentious title, and, had we not some knowledge of the author and his writings, we might be led to expect wild speculations. But the reader will find little or nothing of this kind. It is a calm and sober investigation of the teachings of science and revelation on the much agitated questions respecting the origin of the world and its inhabitants. Dr. Dawson is known to the reading world as a diligent student of nature, and also a devout student of divine revelation. He does not pursue the study of the one to the neglect of the other, but seeks to gather and combine the light drawn from both. His various publications, in the department of Science, have given him a distinguished reputation as an author.

The present volume takes the place of another work of his, with the title "*Archaia*," published in 1860. So many changes were found necessary to meet advancing speculations in science, that it became essentially a new book, and in accordance with its character and purpose received a new name. It belongs to the class of works, now somewhat common, that aims to effect a reconciliation between the teachings of science and the Bible, or to show how we may "best harmonize our great and growing knowledge of nature with our old and cherished beliefs as to the origin and destiny of man." The aim of the work is not controversial, but in the spirit of true philosophy to ascertain and exhibit the truth. The various subjects discussed cover the chief points raised by modern speculation in regard to the origin of the universe, the Bible account of the creation, the introduction of man into our world, the unity and antiquity of the race etc., etc. There are eleven Appendices, containing special discussion of topics treated of or touched upon in the body of the work. These Appendices are severally, "True and False Evolution: Evolution and Creation by Law: Modes of Creation: Theories of Life: Recent Facts as to the Antiquity of Man: Glacial Periods in connection with Genesis: Chemistry of the Primeval Earth: Tannin and Bhemah: Ancient Mythologies: Assyrian and Egyptian Texts: Species and Varieties in connection with Evolution and the Unity of Man."

Nothing more is necessary to assure the reader that this volume is

one of no ordinary interest, and the acknowledged ability and candor of the author entitle his opinions and conclusions to the greatest weight. With the extraordinary pretensions of some scientists, it is refreshing to find a man like Dr. Dawson assuring us that he "has seen no reason to abandon in the least degree the principles of interpretation" insisted on in his earlier publications. Certain it is, that he has not found it necessary to abandon so many false assumptions, or to modify crude theories, as some who have adopted a different course. With him we are hopeful of an entire harmony, and as he says "the time is perhaps nearer than we anticipate," between science and revelation.

An English Commentary on the Rhesus, Medea, Hippolytus, Alcestis Heraclidæ, Supplices, and Troades of Euripides, with the Scanning of each Play, from the latest and best Authorities. By Charles Anthon, LL. D., late Professor of Greek in Columbia College, New York. 1877. pp. 453.

Dr. Anthon's recognized classical ability is a guarantee for the value of this volume of notes and comments. It brings together the information, references and suggestions which are needed to enable the student of Euripides to master the points of historical and critical difficulties that he will meet with in his works. Rightly used by the student as a help to accurate and careful study, this volume will prove to be of great service. It is very neatly gotten out, in convenient form and arrangement.

Cicero's Tusculan Disputations; also Treatises on the Nature of the Gods, and on the Commonwealth. Literally Translated, Chiefly by C. D. Yonge. 1877. pp. 466.

This forms one of the volumes of "Harper's New Classical Library." The translation, though literal, is easy and graceful, and avoids the unnatural forms that so often offend good taste in such renderings. Basham's translation of a part of the "Commonwealth" is used after careful revision. The treatise on "the Nature of the Gods" is a revision of that usually ascribed to Benjamin Franklin. The best texts have been followed, and the volume is one which will make these great discussions of Cicero really enjoyable to English readers.

D. APPLETON & CO., NEW YORK.

[For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.]

The Church of the Apostles. By the Right Rev. Wm. Ingraham Kip, D. D., LL. D., Bishop of California. pp. 174. 1877.

Bishop Kip is the author of quite a number of works, and writes with clearness and force. The general design of this volume is to present a picture of the Church in the days of its early purity. By "the Church of the Apostles," Dr. Kip does not mean simply the Church of

the times of the Apostles, but specially the Church as it took form and manifestation under the principles of organization and life derived from them and developed in the succeeding centuries. Taking for his starting point the statement of St. Luke, Acts 2 : 42, he comprehends the whole view under the four points: *Creeds*, *Fellowship*, *Eucharist*, and *Liturgies*. Of course, the view presented of Christianity is shaped in the mould of Episcopal teaching and prelatical ecclesiasticism. An apostolic Church is represented as existing only with the three orders of the ministry, and episcopal government. He asserts that "with many on the continent of Europe who followed Luther and Calvin, the chain of the ministry which bound them to apostolic times was broken and a self-constituted authority took its place."

We can by no means subscribe to many of the views urged, especially as to the Church. the authority of tradition, and the primitive ritual, but the tone of the discussion is gentle and Christian, and the work breathes the spirit of an earnest and devoted faith. As an outline view of the chief claims of the Episcopal Church, by one high in its authority and service, the work is a valuable one.

American Addresses, with a Lecture on the Study of Biology. By Thomas H. Huxley. pp. 164. 1877.

Three of these Addresses, given in New York, Sept. 18, 20, 22, 1876, are on Evolution, and attracted much attention and criticism at the time of their delivery. The publishers have done good service in issuing the lectures in this permanent form. They will form an abiding memorial of a distinguished failure to give a 'demonstration' of the kind of 'Evolution' of which Mr. Huxley is a forward representative and champion. It is presumable that the author is master of the fullest available materials for supporting the view he holds. That he has great ability and skill in marshaling them, no reader can doubt. But a calm examination of the argument must make it quickly evident to a logical mind, that the conclusion rests on immense, if not incredible assumptions. The address on the opening of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, and the lecture on the Study of Biology, South Kensington, 1876, complete the volume.

Light: A series of simple, entertaining, and inexpensive Experiments in the Phenomena of Light, for the Use of Students of every age. By Alfred M. Mayer and Charles Bernard. pp. 113. 1877.

The design of this small volume, belonging to the "Experimental Science Series for Beginners," is stated in the preface to be, "to furnish a number of simple and easy experiments in the phenomena of light, that any one can perform with materials that may be found in any dwelling-house, or that may be bought for a small sum in any town or city." The design has been well carried out. It will prove

an admirable guide to students and teachers who are without extensive apparatus, enabling them to perform many interesting and instructive experiments with scarcely any cost.

Mesmerism, Spiritualism, &c. Historically and Scientifically Considered. Being two Lectures delivered at the London Institution. With Preface and Appendix. By William B. Carpenter, C. B., M. D., LL. D., F. R. S., F. G. S., V. P. L. S., Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, Registrar of the University of London, etc. pp. 158. 1877.

In the first of these Lectures Dr. Carpenter speaks of Epidemic Delusions in general, and discusses Mesmerism, Odylism, Electro-Biology, the Pendule Explorateur, the Divining Rod and Thought-Reading. In the second lecture, he treats of Mesmeric Clairvoyance, Table-Turning, and Table-Talking, and Spiritualism. Dr. Carpenter has endeavored to treat the whole subject historically and scientifically. He maintains that the great part of the alleged phenomena involved are from "either FRADULENT deception or unintentional SELF-deception," or both combined, and that the explanation of all the occurrences or facts that are genuine, is to be obtained from the influence of DOMINANT IDEAS and the principle of EXPECTANCY. He does not believe in the existence of any genuine clairvoyant power.

This volume is a valuable one, and its reading cannot but tend to sober the judgment and guard the mind against frauds and delusions that find too easy a credit among men. We regard some expressions and statements of Dr. Carpenter as objectionable, but the volume is one of ability and value.

T. NELSON & SONS, LONDON, EDINBURGH AND NEW YORK.
For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

Recent Polar Voyages. A Record of Adventure and Discovery. From the Search after Franklin to the British Polar Expedition. pp. 663. 1875–1876.

This is a valuable compend of the chief Arctic explorations. After a sketch of the progress of geographical discovery in the North, from the reign of Henry VII. to the reign of Victoria, there are given, in succession, very satisfactory summaries of the expeditions of Dr. Kane, McClintock, Dr. Hayes, the HANSA and GERMANIA, Lieutenant Payer, Captain Hall in the POLARIS, and Captains Nares and Stephenson in the ALERT and the DISCOVERY. A Chronological List of Arctic Expeditions between 1845 and 1876 is added. The compiler has done his work with excellent judgment and taste, preserving whatever was most valuable and interesting in the original narratives, while compressing them within proper limits.

The reader of this volume will obtain a very clear idea of what has

recently been done in fixing our knowledge of the Arctic regions, and will be impressed by the courage, resolution and endurance of the enthusiastic adventurers who have dared and suffered so much in these explorations. The volume is one, also, of most exciting interest. Many of the scenes and incidents would be strange and extraordinary if introduced by the novelist into the fictions meant to create surprise and wonder. Yet these are genuine experiences, amid the storms, the ice-rafts, the falling bergs, snows and glaciers, and manifold perils of the northern seas. The reader may enjoy here all the excitement of romance while conscious that he is beguiled by no invention of the romancist. A good circumpolar map is prefixed, and the volume is finely illustrated.

General Beckwith: His Life and Labors among the Waldenses of Piedmont. By J. P. Meille, Pastor of the Waldensian Church at Turin. With an Introductory Notice by the Rev. William Arnot. pp. 312.

If any one wishes to know the present state of that strangely interesting communion of Christians, the Waldensian Church, to understand its recent recovery from its persecuted and wasted condition, and to be refreshed by an example of self-renouncing, wise and successful effort in the service of Christ, let him read this account of the life and labors of General Beckwith. Beginning his career as a soldier, disabled at the battle of Waterloo, becoming a Christian, and devoting himself to the service of the Vaudois, laboring with remarkable devotion and wisdom, the history of this English believer is full of instruction and spiritual incitement.

The Teacher's Cabinet, containing Practical Papers on General Sunday School Topics. Contributed by Various Authors. Two vols. First series 1873. Second Series 1874. London: Sunday School Union.

The first of these volumes contains twelve able and valuble discussions of subjects connected with Sunday School work, by Rev. R. W. Dale, of Birmingham, England, Dr. J. H. Vincent, and Dr. Jos. Alden, of New York. W. H. Groser, London, Charles Reed, M. P., F. R. S., and others. They are well suited to impress Sunday School teachers with the importance of their work, and help them into the best methods for success. The second volume is mainly BIBLICAL in the character of its contents, giving Outlines of Scripture Geography, the Structure and Development of the Bible, a Sketch of Bible History, Bible Illustrations and how to use them, Hints on the Preparation of Bible Lessons, &c. They are both well adapted to instruct and stimulate those for whose assistance and benefit they have been prepared. The objections made in one paper, to the use of Church Catechisms in the Sunday School, are of small force, if the Catechism be RIGHTLY used.

Alpine Lyrics. A Selection from the Poems of Meta Heusser-Schweizer. Translated by H. L. L., one of the authors of "Hymns from the Land of Luther," author of "Thoughtful Hours," &c. pp. 101.

Dr. Philip Schaff speaks of the author of these lyrics as "the most gifted and sweetest of female poets in the German tongue," and of her poems as "combining true poetic genius with deep piety." The lyrics of this little volume will serve well to introduce her to American readers. They are characterized by a beautiful tenderness and depth of feeling, under the inspiration of Christian faith.

HURD & HOUGHTON, NEW YORK.
For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

On Poetic Interpretation of Nature. By J. C. Shairp, LL. D., Principal of the United College of St. Salvator and St. Leonard, St. Andrews. pp. 279. 1877.

Principal Shairp has been very favorably known through his "Culture and Religion," and "Studies in Poetry and Philosophy." His works have been marked by such soundness of judgment, cleverness of thought, and transparent purity and beauty of style, as to give him a prominent place among English writers. This small volume sustains the author's high reputation. It is the result of some lectures delivered several years ago to popular audiences. They have been re-written and re-cast into the shape in which they are now published. Their object is to bring out the fact, that, while the several physical sciences explain each some portion of nature's mysteries, yet after all these sciences have had their say and given their explanations, there remains much in nature, especially in its relation to the soul of man, that needs interpretation and recognition.

In the first seven chapters Dr. Shairp discusses the general nature of Poetry and what it involves as an interpretation of the exterual world. The representations of true Poetry are not unreal fancies, fictitious and misleading, but glowing expressions of the deeper spiritual meaning and living realities that belong to nature. True Poetry is possible only when the soul is open to the significance and beauty of the external world, and no one can apprehend the full compass of nature's manifold harmonies, whose own heart is not filled with that central harmony which sets it right with God and man. The progress of Science cannot destroy Poetry, because "every new province of knowledge which science conquers, Poetry may in time enter and possess." The remaining seven chapters point out the various ways in which Poets deal with nature, with numerous illustrations from the poetry of the different periods. It is a book for every well-selected library.

The Bodleys Telling Stories, by the author of "Doings of the Bodley

Family in Town and Country," "Stories from my Attic," "Dream Children," and "Seven Little People and their Friends." With Illustrations. pp. 236. 1877.

This is in every way a charming book for the little folks. Mr. Scudder, the writer of it, evidently knows how both to interest and instruct them. It is beautifully printed, on excellent paper, with numerous telling illustrations. The binding is very unique. Altogether, the volume cannot fail to be a favorite with the children.

POTT, YOUNG & CO., NEW YORK.

The Mystery of Suffering. Six Lectures, by the Rev. S. Baring-Gould, M. A., author of "The Origin and Development of Religious Belief," "Some Modern Difficulties," "Lives of the Saints," "Village Preaching for a Year," &c. London: W. Skeffington and Son. pp. 112. 1877.

This is a small volume on a great subject. It is written with practical aim, and speaks to the heart. The course of thought is best indicated by giving the topics of the six lectures that comprise the work: The Mystery of Suffering, The Occasion of Suffering, The Capacity for Suffering, Suffering Educative, Suffering Evidential, Suffering Sacrificial. Mr. Baring-Gould finds man's liability to suffering necessitated by the exaltation of his nature—the possibilities of joy and blessedness conferred in his spiritual powers and freedom necessarily involving exposure to pain and trial. The book abounds with rich and suggestive thought, in a style full of force and beauty. The author's dislike of Calvinism hardly allows him to do justice to it; and some of his statements about primitive man might bear criticism; but he has given us a discussion of much vigor and freshness, quickening to the heart and mind of the reader.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., CHICAGO.

Monday Chats, by C. A. Sainte-Beuve, of the French Academy. Selected and Translated from the "Causeries du Lundi," with an introductory Essay on the Life and Writings of Sainte-Beuve, by William Mathews, LL. D., author of "Getting on in the world," "Words and their Use and Abuse," etc., etc. 1877. pp. 384.

Dr. Mathews has done a real service to the English readers by the translation of these selections from Sainte-Beuve's "Causeries." They introduce us to an author but little known among us, yet one of the most brilliant critics of recent times. The "Causeries," appeared originally as a series of weekly literary articles, begun in the "Constitutionel" and continued in the Moniteur," from 1849 to 1869, and form many volumes. They attracted great attention and won high praise. The *Edinburgh Review* says of them: "Such admirable bio-

graphical essays on so small a compass are nowhere else to be found. They are miniatures of the most excellent workmanship."

The sketches translated for this volume are of Lewis the Fourteenth, Fenelon, Bossuet, Massillon, Pascal, Rosseau, Madame Geoffrin, Joabert, Guizot, The Abbe Galiani, and Frederick the Great. These are charming literary portraits. It is interesting to trace in them the fact that, despite his chilling skepticism and atheism, Sainte-Beuve could draw beatiful pictures of Christian virtue, and saw the defects in character caused by irreligion in others. Of Frederick the Great, he mentions as his "radical vice, irreverence, *irreligion*," and he quotes, with endorsement, John Muller's judgment: "Frederick wanted only the highest degree of culture, religion, which completes humanity and humanizes all greatness."

Dr. Mathews has given, in the first eighty-six pages of the volume, a charming biographical and literary sketch of Sainte-Beuve.

Echoes from Mist-Land; or The Nibelungen Lay Revealed to Lovers of Romance and Chivalry. By Auber Forrestier. p. 218. 1877.

No small service is being done by earnest scholars, on opening up to English readers a knowledge of the early heroic and mythological literature of Northern Europe. We have already had occasion to call attention to some valuable works in this direction— Prof. Anderson's "Norse Mythology," "Viking Tales of the North," and Holcomb's translation of Tegner's 'Fridthjof's Saga. The volume before us is in the same line of service, as to the German literature of the dawn. The great epic poem of those early days of chivalry and knightly valor, the Nibelungen Lay, is opened to us, not in a translation, but in a rehearsal of the weird and fascinating story in clear and flowing English. The plan has been well conceived and admirably executed. Mr. Forrestier has endeavored to be faithful to the incidents and spirit of the original. It gives a vivid picture of the thought and life of those olden times, and enchains the reader's thought. as the course of strange and exciting adventures is unfolded. The book is one of unusual interest. The author has prefixed a lengthened introduction, explanatory of the Nibelungen literature.

First Lessons in Latin: adapted to the Latin Grammars of Allen and Greenough, Andrews and Stoddard, Bartholomew, Bullion and Morris, Gildersleeve, and Harkness, and prepared as an Introduction to Cæsar's Commentaries on the Gallic War. By Elisha Jones, M. A., Acting Assistant Professor of Latin in the University of Michigan, and author of "Exercises in Greek Prose Composition." pp. 220. 1877.

An examination of this work shows that it combines, in an unusual degree, the best features of a good Latin drill-book for beginners.

The lessons and examples are admirably arranged for guiding the learner into a clear and accurate understanding of the first principles of the language. Made to be used with any of the six Grammars mentioned in the title, teachers will, we believe, find it to be one of the very best manuals for instruction. The publishers have made the paper and type every thing that could be desired.

NATIONAL TEMPERANCE SOCIETY AND PUBLICATION HOUSE: N. YORK.
For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

Alcohol and the State. A Discussion of the Problem of Law as applied to the Liquor Traffic. By Robert C. Pitman, LL. D., Associate Justice of the Superior Court of Massachusetts. pp. 406. 1877.

The liquor traffic is the most gigantic evil of civilized nations, and its overthrow presents the most important social problem of the age. When the enormous wrongs and destructions which the traffic inflicts are looked at, the indifference and patience of society under the wasting injuries become very amazing. The reluctance to crush the evil is evidence of some grievous perversion of public sentiment. Works like the one before us cannot fail to do good in hastening on the day of correct thinking and right action on the subject.

Dr. Pitman's book is calm, clear, and strong. It bears the marks, all through, of a sound legal mind and scholarly ability. It is not made up of random assertions and loose declamation, but deals with the facts of the subject calmly and on the broadest principles of statesmanship. The volume is divided into two parts. The first part is entitled "Alcohol *versus* the State," and investigates the evils of the traffic, in the waste of material wealth and the destruction of homes, in pauperism, in crime, in the vitiation of the human stock, and in its being the universal ally of evil and antagonist of good. The second part is "the State *versus* Alcohol," in which the author treats of the province of law, liberty and government, the license laws, the necessity of prohibition, etc. The discussions are brief, clear and impressive, bristling with statistics and facts that confirm the conclusions with startling force. Dr. Pitman makes short work of the objection, that prohibition reacts unfavorably by leading to secret drinking. The work is a most valuable one, and should have a wide circulation.

SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO., NEW YORK.
(Through J. B. Lippincott & Co.)

The Final Philosophy, or System of Perfectible Knowledge Issuing from the Harmony of Science and Religion. By Charles Woodruff Shields, D. D., Professor of Princeton College. Member of the American Philosophical Society. pp. viii., 609. 1877.

This is a weighty volume in more senses than one. Occupying more than 600 pages, it treats of some of the most difficult problems in science, philosophy and religion. It comes forth as the first-fruits of a foundation established in Princeton College in the year 1865. Dr. Shields, who is the incumbent on this foundation, was known in Philadelphia as a very thoughtful student and chaste writer. In 1861, he issued an *Essay* entitled *Philosophia Ultima*, which had much to do with the establishment of a special chair in Princeton College, and the author's being called to occupy it. The present volume bears ample evidence of how diligently he has cultivated his chosen field. He has gathered material from an immense range of authors, and given us the result of reading that shows the enthusiastic scholar. The list of authors, whose opinions are cited in the volume, numbers about a thousand, and represents the widest range of thought.

The plan of the work is comprehensive, and carried out with painstaking care. After an INTRODUCTION, on "*The Academic Study of Christian Science*," in which he presents what he considers as necessary to a proper adjustment of the antagonisms which have been found existing between science and religion, and that the two may be harmonized in a complete and final philosophy, the ultimate truth, the treatment of the subject is divided into two parts. In the *first Part*, which occupies about two-thirds of the volume, we have presented "*The Philosophical parties as to the relations between Science and Religion.*" The separate chapters in this division treat in order of "*Early Conflicts and Alliances between Science and Religion: Modern Antagonisms between Science and Religion: Modern Indifferentism between Science and Religion: Modern Eclecticism between Science and Religion: Modern Skepticism between Science and Religion.*" In the discussion of these topics the author is led to consider the difficulties which have been felt between Science and Religion, beginning as far back as five hundred years before the Christian era. The chief part of the discussion. however, is confined to the conflicts of modern times, or since the beginning of the fifteenth century. Here where the greatest interest naturally centres the treatment is minute and full. The conflicts arising from investigations and discoveries in the various departments of astronomy, geology, anthropology, psychology, sociology, theology, and philosophy, are all passed under careful review. The plan of the work causes some repetition of the same subjects and authors under different heads, but it may add to the clearness and fullness of the presentation. It is to some extent a history of scientific and religious thought during more than four hundred years of the immediate past, and cannot be read without interest and instruction. There is a wonderful amount of matter drawn together and condensed into these four hundred pages. This elaborate and careful survey of all the apparent din and conflict of opinions closes

with a very cheering and hopeful view of the whole subject. "We may therefore conclude, after a full survey of all modern philosophical opinions, that the two great interests of religion and science are not only reconcilable, but [are] being reconciled. Let neither the scientist nor the religionist despair of their ultimate harmony, but rather let both strive together to effect it, and therein hail at once the thorough fusion of Christianity and civilization and the practical union of earth and heaven."

The spirit and style of the discussion are in marked contrast with some of the works treating of the same general subject. Let any one, for instance, compare such a wretched performance as Dr. Draper's *Conflict of Science and Religion* with this calm aud scholarly work of Dr. Shields, and he will realize the difference between a mere pretender and a genuine student in such a field.

The *Second Part* of the volume discusses "*The Philosophical Theory of the Harmony of Science and Religion,*" Here again we have five Chapters, treating successively of "*The Umpirage of Philosophy between Science and Religion: The Positive Philosophy: The Absolute Philosophy: The Final Philosophy: Philosophia Ultima.*" Dr. Shields claims that Philosophy must act as umpire between Science and Religion, and yet not in any such sense that either must sacrifice anything that is real or true. It must decide between the true and the false in both, and thus bring the truth of both into harmony. In this view, which is doubtless the correct one, neither has any cause to dread philosophy. He shows the errors, and insufficiency of much that has passed for Philosophy to meet the end desired, and the need of a true final Philosophy.

Although the title of this volume may sound a little pretentious, the reader will find nothing to offend in this respect. Dr. Shields everywhere shows the modest humility that marks the true inquirer after truth. There is no vain boasting, or "great swelling words" of vanity. Confident only in the triumph of truth, he patiently prosecutes his inquiries. He regards himself as simply making his contribution towards "the completion of the final philosophy," which "can only be the work of many minds through coming generations." Unless we are mistaken this will be regarded as one of the most judicious and valuable contributions yet made to the great object in view.

Faith and Philosophy: Discourses and Essays, By Henry B. Smith, D. D., LL. D. Edited with an Introductory notice By George L. Prentiss, D. D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, in the City of New York. pp. xiv., 496 1877.

This is another volume of very substantial reading and a fitting companion of the one just noticed. It is not very often that two such volumes appear at the same time and by the same publishers.

The authors of these *Discourses and Essays* was better known to the circle of theological and critical readers than the author of the Final Philosophy. Indeed few, if any, scholars in our country had won a higher reputation for breadth of learning, accompanied by profundity and acuteness of thought. As a critic and reviewer, in his department, he had no superior and few equals. When he undertook to discuss a subject he made thorough work. It is greatly to be regretted that Dr. Smith did not live to give to the Church more of the ripened fruits of his laborious study.

The present volume has been edited by his colleague, Dr. Prentiss, who furnishes an *Introductory Notice*, containing a brief sketch of the Life and character of Dr. Smith, with an estimate of his merits as a scholar and a divine. The volume takes its title from the first article, and also from the general character of the discussions. Some of the papers comprised in the volume attracted marked attention when first published, and have been republished in different forms. The selection has been made with excellent judgment, and embraces the following: *The Relations of Faith and Philosophy*, (*1849*): *Nature and Worth of the Science of Church History*, (*1851*): *The Reformed Churches of Europe and America in relation to General Church History*, (*1855*): *The Idea of Christian Theology as a System*, (*1855*): *The New Latitudinarians of England*, (*1861*): *The Theological System of Emmons*, (*1862*): *Christian Union and Ecclesiastical Reunion*, (*1864*): *Hamilton's Theory of Knowledge*, (*1861*): *Draper's Intellectual Development of Europe*, (*1863*): *Whedon on the Will*, (*1865*): *Renan's Life of Jesus*, (*1864*) *The New Faith of Strauss*, (*1874*(.

Some of these discussions are of more permanent value than others, but none of them are lacking in qualities of sterling merit. His criticism and exposure of error is keen, and the freedom from extravagance in language shows his consciousness of strength. We recall the satisfaction we felt at reading most of these articles as they appeared, and are glad to see them now in this collected and more convenient form. It is surely to be hoped that this volume may receive such a welcome as will encourage the publication of a second, for which we are informed there is "ample material."

The appearance of these two volumes must be regarded as very opportune. The reading public has been fairly surfeited with lectures, addresses, pamphlets and volumes to show the dangers to which the Bible and religion are exposed from the achievements of science. Some timid people may have felt alarmed. But such substantial discussions as these, by men occupying prominent positions in orthodox centres, are caculated to quiet any such apprehensions. We commend not only to Christian readers, but to the whole school of "advanced thinkers," these volumes by champions of a sound philosophy and a true religion.

Theological Essays. By William G. T. Shedd, D. D., Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York. pp. 383. 1877.

This is a new edition of a volume of Theological Essays, which was received with marked favor on its first appearance some twenty years ago. The essay upon Evolution, we are told, "has been recast, amplified, and carefully revised," in order to meet some more modern phases of thought and discussion. It is hardly necessary to commend these Essays to those who are interested in such subjects. Dr. Shedd is a vigorous thinker and careful writer. The last essay, that on clerical education, might be read with special profit by some in the Lutheran Church, who are writing about surplus ministers and decrying Theological Seminaries. Theological students will find it a valuable volume to read.

The Beginnings of Christianity, with a view of the state of the Roman World at the birth of Christ. By George P. Fisher, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College; author of "Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity," "The Reformation," etc. pp. 591. 1877.

We cannot better present, in few words, the aim and compass of this volume, than is done by the author himself. He says: "I have undertaken, first, to describe the Ancient Roman World, including both Heathen and Jewish Society, into which Christianity entered, and in which it first established itself; secondly, to examine the New Testament documents from which our knowledge of the beginnings of the Christian religion must be derived; and thirdly, to discuss some of the most important topics connected with the Life of Jesus and the Apostolic Age."

It will be readily seen that this volume covers a very important field of inquiry, and it is marked by the careful investigations which characterize the productions of this author. There is a large amount of information furnished on subjects which are not within the range of study for ordinary readers. We regard Prof. Fisher ordinarily a safe guide, but on several points in this volume, we are compelled to dissent. On what seems to us very insufficient grounds, he fixes the date of the Apocalypse between 68 and 70, ignoring entirely the arguments for a considerably later date. He also holds that "the Apostles cherished the hope and expectation that the Lord would soon return," which he admits was a "mistaken expectation." We are informed, that in the Apostolic age, "in towns, where the number of Christians were considerable, the eldership was plural. * * But in country places, a single elder presided over a church." We should like to have the evidence of this. So, too, we are quietly informed, "Baptism, it is now generally agreed among scholars, was commonly by immer-

sion." Dr. Dale, who has written four volumes on the subject, and who would not agree to this statement, is to be set aside, as not "among scholars." The volume is perhaps unconsciously tinged with the ecclesiastical views of the author. With some considerable abatements, the volume is still one that may be recommended for very substantial merits, and a valuable contribution to the literature bearing on that period of the Christian Church.

Of the volumes noticed from Scribner, Armstrong & Co., we are glad to see Indexes to those of Drs. Shilds, Smith, and Fisher. No standard volume should be issued without an Index.

JAS. R. OSGOOD & CO., BOSTON.
(Through J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.)

Boston Monday Lectures. Vol. I. Biology, with Preludes on Current Events. Vol. II. Transcendentalism, with Preludes on Current Events. By Joseph Cook. pp. 325, 305. 1877, 1878.

It is perhaps too soon to pronounce an impartial verdict upon these volumes of Lectures. Mr. Cook is in the full tide of popularity as a public lecturer. His discussions of the most difficult problems in science, philosophy and religion, have been listened to by crowded audiences, including as we are informed, "in large numbers, representatives of the broadest scholarship, the profoundest philosophy, the acutest scientific research, and generally of the finest intellectual culture, of Boston and New England." The men having charge of these Lectures are among the most dlstinguished scholars of the day in this centre of New England culture. Mr. Cook has undoubtedly achieved a success which is truly wonderful. He has succeeded in catching the ear of earnest thinking men, and of active business men, and to some extent, at least, has stemmed if not turned the tide of popular sentiment among those inclined to skepticism. He has dared to tell the free-thinkers and rationalists of Boston how shallow their science and religion are. He has spoken bold, if not brave words, in the very presence of men accustomed to treat orthodox believers with mingled pity and contempt. He has hurled defiance in the very teeth of New England opposition to orthodoxy. For the service he has rendered we in turn render him all honor. He has no doubt, in some ways, accomplished good.

But, unless we are mistaken, the calm, sober judgment of coming time will make a considerable abatement of the estimation in which these Lectures will be held as of permanent value. When the excitement of the occasion and the glare of the rhetoric have lost most of their influence, and we are seeking after the truth that remains, there will be found, we believe, not only a great deal of extravagance in style, but a considerable amount of doubtful science, unsound reasoning, strained analogies, and uncertain conclusions. Mr. Cook is

stronger and more successful in demolishing a false theory, or exposing an unsound doctrine, than he is in establishing the truth. His criticism of Transcendentalism in New England is severe and overwhelming. Theodore Parkerism, we believe the name is authorized, is shown to be utterly unworthy of reverence on the score of critical learning, genuine philosophy, or religious conviction. It is a weak style of skepticism. And much the same might be said of a good deal of his exposures of some scientific theories set up against the Bible and religion. He is strong as an assailant, and his Lectnres will do good in this direction.

But when Mr. Cook comes to demonstrate on scientific grounds, the existence and immortality of the soul; to show by aid of the scalpel and microscope the existence of mind and thought; to illustrate by analogies the incarnation and the Trinity, until all mystery shall disappear, we feel that he is treading not only on doubtful ground, but on ground that utterly fails to uphold him. We would not like to accept Mr. Cook's defences of some of the deepest mysteries of Christianity, or to allow him to stand as a representative of defenders of the orthodox faith.

No impartial judge will deny that Mr. Cook possesses great power in getting hold of a point, in bringing it out distinctly to view, or throwing light upon it from various quarters, of culling the sharpest sayings from the best writers and using them to his advantage, of vivid pictorial illustration, in a word, of the most essential qualities of a popular lecturer and debater. He has evidently read and studied upon the topics he discusses, and comes with them before the public with an intense enthusiasm, which in turn begets enthusiasm, often showing itself in outward applause.

But there is a lack of genuine humility, of quiet simplicity begotten of sober judgment and settled truth. His style is florid, sometimes grandiloquent, and the language runs away with the thought.

We cannot criticise particular points in these lectures. They have a strong mixture of good and bad qualities—the good upon the whole preponderating. They will be read by thousands who would not read more sober and quiet discussions of these lofty themes. The truth in them will endure. The rhetoric and occasional inaccuracy, and the doubtful reasoning in some places, will receive their correction. Those most likely to find fault with Mr. Cook's style of discussion have least occasion to. They have had well nigh a monopoly of the use of certain weapons which he has turned against them with terrible effect. If they do not relish ridicule and irony, and to have their weak points mercilessly exposed, they should not attempt the use of such methods.

These volumes will doubtless have, as in many respects they deserve, a very wide reading.

ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.
(Through Smith, English & Co., Phila.)

Brighter than the Sun; or Christ the Light of the World. A Life of our Lord for the Young. By J. R. Macduff, D. D. With Illustrations by A. Rowan. pp. xii., 433. 1878.

This is really in every respect an attractive volume. It is gotten out as a holiday book, and is dressed in beautiful holiday attire. The binding, though not costly, is such as will please the eye, and make it suitable for holiday purposes. The illustrations, which are quite numerous, are fresh and striking, serving to bring out into more distinct view some of the most interesting scenes in the life of the Saviour. There is nothing common-place in these illustrations.

But what has been thus mentioned is, after all, not the chief excellence of this volume. Whilst the style in which it is published and illustrated will please the eye, the contents of the volume will interest, instruct, and improve the mind. It is a volume of truth, beautifully expressed, in the glowing style for which the author is celebrated as a religious writer. The work is designed especially for the young, not little children, but will be found attractive reading for those of any age. It does not profess to be a learned life of Christ, of which we have so many, nor yet a book for those who want only simple stories, but a book that calls for and stimulates thought. The reading of it will serve to exalt in the mind and heart Him, who is indeed "*Brighter than the Sun.*"

[For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.]

Among the Turks. By Cyrus Hamlin. pp. 378. 1878.

The author of this volume has spent a large part of his life in Turkey as a missionary. He knows whereof he speaks, and has special claims to be heard. Such a volume would interest at any time, but it will be specially interesting at this time, when Turkey and her fortunes are engaging so much attention. It is well known that Dr. Hamlin cherishes a more favorable view of Turkish policy than some other writers or than that commonly held. It can do no harm to hear all that can be said in favor of Turkish progress. The volume is not an orderly arranged history, but a presentation of observations and experiences of various kinds in the Turkish Empire. It does, however, contain a sketch of the origin, character, growth and extent of the Ottoman Empire, with references to the social life, educational institutions, laws, religion, evangelistic efforts, reforms, military character, etc., etc. Numerous erroneous judgments are pointed out. Such writers as Dr. Draper and Mr. Bosworth Smith, who have undertaken to enlighten the world on some subjects treated of by the writer, are subjected to severe criticism. All who are interested in the movements now going on in the East—and who is not?—will find

this a very entertaining volume to read. It contains a great deal of information of value to all readers, and much of special interest to the friends of Christian missions. The venerable author, now connected with Bangor Theological Seminary, refers with feeling, in the Preface, to "the privilege and solace of age to go back upon the past and recount what has been, as the future closes up and little remains to be achieved or attempted."

Lettice Eden: or, the Lamps of Earth and the Light of Heaven. A Tale of the Last days of King Henry the Eighth. By Emily Sarah Holt, author of "Mistress Margery," "Robin Tremayne," "Clare Avery" etc. pp. 376. 1877.

As the title imports, the book is a tale, and yet has a substantial basis of truth. The scene is laid in one of the most interesting periods of English history—when religion and morals were both severely tried. The story is designed especially for girls, who may be exposed to the whirlpools into which so many are drawn. It points out the danger and the only way of safety.

The Giant-Killer; or the Battle which all must fight. By A. L. O. E., Author of "Claremont Tales," "Indian Stories," "Eden in England," etc. pp. 195. 1878.

The Roby Family; or Battling with the world. A Sequel to "the Giant-Killer; or the Battle which all must fight." By A. L. O. E. pp. 195. 1878.

These two books, in one volume, by the same author, are designed to teach most important lessons of moral and religious truth. The one is a sequel to the other. The former presents the Christian warfare in the form of allegory—the latter presents the truth without this guise. The volume will be found very interesting and instructive to the young for whom it is specially designed.

A Peep behind the Scenes. By Mrs. Walton, author of "Christie's Old Organ," etc. pp. 346. 1878.

This volume graphically illustrates the vanity of the allurements of the world, and all its glittering show. We are allowed to see beneath the surface of things, and our thoughts are directed to what is more real and satisfying.

The Gospel Pointing to the Person of Christ. By the Rev. Andrew A. Bonar, author of "Memoirs of the Rev. R. McCheyne," "Commentary on the Book of Leviticus," etc. From the Fifteenth Thousand of the Scotch edition. pp. 155. 1878.

The aim of this little volume is to direct attention to the import-

ance of the doctrine of the *Person of Christ* as the very essence of the Gospel. It has had a wide circulation in Scotland, and will doubtless meet with the same favor here.

Jack O' Lantern. A Tale. pp. 319. 1878.

This is a tale of a wayward boy, who was won to a better spirit and life by kindness. It is designed to illustrate the good which may be accomplished with such, and closes with the Scripture lesson, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least," etc.

Blackberry Jam. By Joanna H. Mathews, author of the "Bessie Books," etc. pp. 305. 1878.

The author of this volume is well known as a writer for the young. This volume is the story of a poor Irish laborer, Philip Maloney. The title, *Blackberry Jam* is taken from some of the leading incidents in the story.

All of these story books may be safely commended both on account of their attractive character and the truths inculcated.

LEE & SHEPARD, BOSTON, MASS.

"*Abide with me.*" By Henry Francis Lyte. With designs by Miss L. B. Humphrey, engraved by John Andrew & Son. 1878.

This house publishes annually a favorite hymn illustrated. This is an exquisite volume, and like its predecessor must be popular. We know of no volumes more suitable as gifts to a friend, or more worthy a place in every Christian family. They will serve to cultivate the taste as well as to cherish the lessons of Christian truth. We have had "*Nearer my God to Thee,*" and "*Oh! why should the spirit of mortal be proud?* and now, not less attractive in style, "*Abide with me.*" Such volumes must be popular in the best sense.

The New England Ministry Sixty Years Ago. The Memoir of John Woodbridge, D. D. His method of work; his great success in powerful revivals, in high moral and educational influences; his theological views, and the theological controversies of his time, beginning with the "new departure" of Stoddard. By Rev. Sereno D. Clark. pp. xxi., 473. 1877.

The somewhat lengthy title page of this volume gives a tolerably distinct view of its character and contents, and obviates the necessity of a lengthened notice. In a condensed form the substance of the volume is expressed in this title. Dr. Woodbridge was a man of mark in New England, and his life covered a most important period in the history of New England theology and the New England Churches. Born in Southampton, Mass., December 2d, 1784, and livng till September 26th, 1869, his life extended over nearly eighty-five years.

There were giants in those days in New England, and Dr. Woodbridge was one among them. He took a prominent part in the movements for the extension of Christ's kingdom in the earth, but belonged to and co-operated with the conservative or Old School of Calvinistic theology. His views led him into controversies, resulting in estrangements and separations. This volume throws light upon the spirit of that age in New England, and is not only interesting as a memoir, but instructive as a contribution to the religious history of that period in New England. It has been prepared with evident care, and excellent judgment, and is furnished with an instructive Appendix including various special points omitted in the body of the volume. We welcome it to a place in our religious biographies.

Go up higher, or Religion in Common Life. By James Freeman Clarke, author of "The Hour which Cometh," "Ten Great Religions," "Steps of Belief," "Orthodoxy, its Truths and Errors," etc. pp. vi., 336. 1877.

Those who know the theological status of James Freeman Clarke will not need to be told that they must not look for much of what is usually styled religion in this volume. His religion is of the broadest style, and he does not affect to conceal it. Apart from the lack of what we deem essential to genuine religion or true Christianity, the volume contains a great deal of valuable moral and semi-religious truth well put, and calculated to make an impression. It will do very well to read, as full of good sharp points, and inculcating practical wisdom and human virtue, but it must have been very poor food for hungry, perishing souls, asking for the bread of eternal life.

The Telephone: An Account of the Phenomena of Electricity, Magnetism, and Sound, as involved in its action. With directions for making a Speaking Telephone. By Prof. A. E. Dolbear, Tufts College, author of "The Art of Projecting," etc. pp. 128. 1877.

This little volume furnishes just such information as many desire in regard to the telephone. It is published in very neat style, and illustrated by drawings explaining the subject.

Elm Island Series. Complete in six volumes. Illustrated. 1878.
Our Lucky Series. Four vols., to be completed. 1878.

We will only say of these Series, that we know of nothing more captivating and instructive for boys. We have tried them, and know whereof we speak. If any doubt, let them purchase one or both of these Series and give them to their boys, and if they are not appreciated we will be greatly mistaken. They are published in a very attractive form, and nothing seems lacking to make them deservedly popular.

SHELDON & CO., NEW YORK.

A Vocabulary of the Philosophical Sciences. (Including the Vocabulary of Philosophy, Mental, Moral, and Metaphysical, by William Fleming, D. D., Prof. of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow, from the second edition, 1860: and the third, 1876, edited by Henry Calderwood, LL. D.) By Charles P. Krauth, S. T. D., LL. D., Vice-Provost of the University of Pennsylvania. pp. xxii., 1044. 1878.

This is in part a new edition of a former work, and in part entirely new; so that the least that can be said is, that it is an enlarged and greatly improved work. It contains about one half more matter than the former one. The most important addition is that of a "*Vocabulary of the Philosophical Sciences*," by the American editor, Dr. C. P. Krauth. As now enlarged and improved the value of this work to students and scholars can hardly be over estimated. It is to the study of philosophy what a dictionary is in the study of a language, and if not an absolute necessity, must greatly facilitate the acquisition of knowledge in this very wide and somewhat difficult field. The editor has done a work for students which they cannot fail to appreciate. As a book for reference it will be found very convenient, and should be in every well furnished library. The revisions and additions bring the treatment of the subject matter down to the present time. The volume, though containing over a thousand pages, is quite as convenient to handle as the old edition; and both in size and cost will commend itself to those who have most occasion for its constant use. The publishers have done their part well, and in every way it is a volume to be commended to learners and scholars.

WARREN F. DRAPER, ANDOVER, MASS.
(Through Smith, English & Co., Phila.)

Hermeneutics of the New Testament. By Dr. A. Immer, Professor of Theology in the University of Berne. Translated from the German by Albert H. Newman. pp. xvii., 395. 1877.

Notwithstanding the number of works on this subject before the public, there is room for a scholarly treatise on Hermeneutics. There has been advance in New Testament criticism, and with it some advance may be expected in the principles of interpretation. Dr. Immer, whilst professedly orthodox, seems to belong to a rather liberal school in regard to the inspiration of the Scriptures, and their infallibility. He says: "The history of Scripture interpretation from the beginning down to the present day teaches that all differences in the treatment of Scripture, have proceeded from *different views of Scripture itself*, and that these may be reduced to two fundamental aspects—the dogmatic and the historical." He adopts the historical aspect, and hence

finds a good deal of room for explanations based on the "national, temporal, and individual forms" in which the truth is set. The work is divided into three general parts. Part I. The General Principles of Hermeneutics. Part II. The Single Operations of the Scripture Interpreter. Part III. The Religious Understanding. There is also an Appendix, quite brief, by the translator, on the leading peculiarties of New Testament Greek, from Notes of Dr. J. A. Broadus, with an Index of Scripture Passages treated in the vol., and a General Index. The Index of Scripture passages might be more complete.

The volume, as a whole, is a valuable addition to our aids for a careful critical study of the New Testament. Of such study there is special need just now. Under false notions that the Bible may not only be read and studied by all for their religious benefit, but that all may interpret for themselves without the requisite qualifications, and build up a theology of their own, many persons, with no knowledge of the principles of Hermeneutics, and no acquaintance with the original Scriptures, set themselves up as teachers against the accepted faith of the Church, and against the evident meaning of the divine word. The author vindicates the right of the common people to study and interpret the word of God, so far as they do not attempt to know more and understand better than by their special education and knowledge they can know. But the Bible must be studied and understood, not only by the aid of the Spirit, but by the aid of sound exegesis and correct principles of interpretation. This volume is very condensed in nearly all its statements, so that we have a great deal of matter in a comparatively small compass. We cannot go into a detailed criticism, but find much in the work to commend, and doubt not that it will aid the cause of sacred learning.

J. M. STODDARD & CO., PHILA.

The Encyclopædia Britannica. A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and General Literature. Ninth Edition, (American Reprint). Vol. VI. pp. 746. 1877.

This is the sixth volume of this great work. There seems little necessary beyond the announcement to our readers of the appearance of another volume, with the progress it is making. This volume extends from C.—Clichy, to D.—Dayton. The reader can easily determine what subjects are included. As in all works of this kind, there will be numerous less important topics introduced and briefly noticed, but quite a number of subjects are discussed with great fullness. This applies to subjects of various kinds—biographical, geographical, mechanical, scientific, political, etc., etc. More than twenty pages are devoted to clocks, with drawings, more than thirty to coal, twenty-five to costume, nearly the same to cotton, and other subjects in proportion. The discussion of leading subjects is remarkably able and

full. The work is a great store-house of collected knowledge. We feel a little impatient at the slow rate at which these volumes appear, but there may be some compensating advantages in the way of thoroughness of preparation, and the convenience to many in making payment. We shall hail with pleasure the appearance of each successive volume. The American publishers deserve credit for the neatness and cheapness of this edition.

E. P. DUTTON & CO., NEW YORK.

Lectures on Preaching, Delivered before the Divinity School of Yale College, in January and February, 1877, by the Rev. Phillips Brooks, Rector of Trinity Church, Boston. pp. 281. 1877.

This volume contains the lectures delivered on "The Lyman Beecher Lectureship on Preaching" in Yale College, in the early part of last year. They were received with marked favor at the time of their delivery, and the reader will not be disappointed in the impression they make in print. Few books on such a subject read better than these lectures—indeed we cannot name any volume on preaching that is more readable. The lecturer has avoided the old beaten paths, and furnished something fresh and living. It does not profess to be a treatise on homiletics, but a discussion of topics vital to the preacher and his work. The subjects treated are: "*The two elements in preaching: The preacher himself: The preacher in his work: The idea of the sermon: The making of the sermon: The congregation: The ministry for the age: The value of the human soul:*" The qualities which distinguish the volume are freedom from all cant and formality, directness, good common sense, moral and spiritual earnestness, clearness of insight into the work of preaching, reverence for the office and a proper estimate of the value of the human soul. The style is simple and full of animation. There is no dullness in the book. The theological student or minister who can read these lectures without being deeply impressed, is not fit to preach the gospel; and if any read them without profit, the fault must be their own.

A. S. BARNES & CO., NEW YORK.

Nine Lectures on Preaching. Delivered at Yale College, New Haven, Conn., by R. W. Dale, D. D., Birmingham. pp. 302. 1878.

This is another volume on the same foundation as that just noticed —and the fifth and last of the course of lectures thus far delivered. It was a special compliment to Dr. Dale as the first lecturer from abroad to teach us on this side of the ocean how to preach. He disclaims all pretence to originality or brilliance, and says: "An Englishman was sent for, that for once you might have the opportunity of listening to lectures containing nothing fresh, nothing that should have the look of novelty, nothing but what had been familiar to men

for hundreds of years, nothing but what was trite and common place." The reader will probably not entirely agree with Dr. Dale that there is "nothing but what was trite and common place." The lectures are marked by strong common sense, a masculine style, and at times a very pointed way of putting the truth. They have not the sweet tenderness of Phililips Brooks' lectures, nor the rich flavor of gentle piety, but they abound in practical sagacity and sober truth. The subjects of the lectures are, "Perils of young preachers: The intellect in relation to preaching: Reading: Reading (concluded): The preparation of sermons: Extemporaneous preaching and style: Evangelistic preaching: Pastoral preaching: The conduct of public worship: (conclusion)."

It will be seen that these two courses of lectures traverse widely different fields, and both may be commended for excellencies of their own particular kind. They are valuable contributions to the great work of preaching.

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, (N. THISSELL), PHILA.

The Old Bible and the New Science. An Essay and Four Lectures delivered before the New York Baptist Ministers' Conference, by J. B. Thomas, D. D., Pastor first Baptist Church in Pierrepont street, Brooklyn. Second Editon. pp. 224.

The essay and lectures discuss topics now engaging no little attention. The conflict started between certain speculations by scientists and certain interpretations of the divine word bids fair to continue for some time to come. One advantage will be a more careful examination of the ground on both sides. We need have no fear that in the end truth will triumph. The friends of the Bible and religion have not been slow to meet the issue. Dr. Thomas has done good service in exposing some of the pretences of false science, showing its insufficiency to meet our religious wants, and the essential harmony between true science, as now understood, and divine revelation. The contents are: "*Evolution or special creation—which? Can Science give us a new Bible? Ancient hints of modern discussions: Science and Providence: The plan of redemption from a scientific standpoint.*"

Daughters of Armenia. By Mrs. S. A. Wheeler, Missionary in Turkey. pp. 157. 1877.

This is a very interesting little volume on a most interesting part of the work of Missions. Armenia has special claims upon our sympathy and efforts. This simple narrative of facts, by one who has labored in the field, furnishes useful information both as to the work to be done and the success thus far attending the efforts in behalf of that people. It is specially dedicated by the author to "her Christian sisters in America, and to their children."

PORTER & COATES, PHILADELPHIA.

A Miracle in Stone: or The Great Pyramid of Egypt. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., Pastor of the Church of the Holy Communion, Phila., Pa., author of "Last Times," "Lectures on the Gospels," "Lectures on the Apocalypse," "The Gospel in Leviticus," etc. pp. 250.

This volume embraces three lectures by the author on the Great Pyramid of Egypt. The aim of these lectures is to show that the Pyramid was built under divine direction, and that it is a wonderful revelation of the divine character and will—a revelation from God in stone. We cannot follow the author through all his ingenious interpretations and applications, but must be allowed to say that he has utterly failed to convince us of his theory. The author has showed care in gathering up the results of much laborious research, and the book is quite interesting reading, but so far as the main point is concerned, we must render the verdict—not proved.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY.
42 North Ninth Street, Philadelphia.

Talks about India: For boys and girls. By Rev. A. D. Rowe, M. S., Missionary to India of the "Children's Missionary Society" of the Lutheran Church. pp. 192. 1878.

This is in every respect an admirable little volume. It furnishes just such information as boys and girls, and some older people, need. The object is to awaken an intelligent interest in the heathen by imparting information as to the country, the people, their manners and customs, etc., etc. It is intimated that another volume may follow in due time—"Talks About Mission Work." We are sure that it will meet a hearty welcome. This volume is brought out in a style that reflects credit on our Publication House. The style and mechanical execution are equal to anything we have seen in this class of books. The pleasant face of the author, fronting the title page, will afford pleasure to his many friends. Let it have a wide circulation. It cannot but do good.

DODD, MEAD & CO., NEW YORK.

The Harmony of the Reformed Confessions, as related to the Present State of Evangelical Theology. An Essay delivered before the General Presbyterian Council at Edinburgh, July 4, 1877. By Philip Schaff, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Together with the action of the Council on Confessions and Formulas of Subcription. pp. 70. 1877.

Dr. Schaff 's Essay is very significant so far as the Reformed Confessions are concerned. It shows a restless condition of things, and a striving towards something better. Not only is there great diversity among the Reformed Confessions, but some of them contain what,

as he says, "No Reformed Synod (at least on the Continent) could now pass." * * We agree with him that, "The five knotty points of Calvinism have lost their point, and have been smoothed off by God's own working in the history of the Church." So far we have no objection to what he has to say, if his brethren are satisfied. But we object very decidedly against his misrepresentations of the Lutheran Creed. At nearly every point the Lutheran doctrine is contrasted unfavorably with the Reformed. For instance, the learned Presbyterian Council were told that the Lutheran Symbols "*teach unconditional baptismal regeneration*," while the Calvinistic "make spiritual regeneration independent of water baptism." Whether the adherents of Calvinistic symbols will accept Dr. Schaff's statement as correct on their side, we cannot say, but we utterly disclaim his statement in regard to the Lutheran Symbols. He ought to know better, and knowing it, he should not bear false testimony before such a Council as that assembled in Edinburgh. Dr. Hodge says, in his *Systematic Theology*: "*It is the clearly pronounced doctrine of the Lutheran Church that Baptism is altogether useless or void of any saving effect, unless the recipient be a believer.*" We commend Dr. Schaff to the venerable Princeton divine on this subject.

CONGREGATIONAL PUBLISHING SOCIETY, BOSTON.

Notes on the International S. S. Lessons for 1878. Part I., O. T. By Rev. John E. Todd; Part II., N. T. By Matthew B. Riddle, D. D. pp. 220. 1877.

The Little Pilgrim Question Book on the International Lesson for 1878. For the younger Scholars. By Mrs. William Barrows. pp. 221. 1878.

The National Question Book and Hand-Book on the Lesson for 1878. By Rev. John E. Todd and Rev. M. B. Riddle, D. D., for older scholars. pp. 203. These volumes furnish a very complete apparatus for the International S. S. Lessons for 1878. They have been prepared with care and by competent hands.

LUTHERAN BOOK STORE, 117 NORTH 6TH ST., PHILA.

Sunday-School Book, without Music, for the use of Evangelical Lutheran Congregations. pp. 144. 1877.

The Helper. A monthly Magazine for Home and School. Edited by Rev. J. Fry, D. D. pp. 16. Dec., 1877.

The Lutheran Chur h in Botetourt County, Va., Together with a brief notice of the Lutheran Church in General. By Rev. F. V. N. Painter, Pastor. pp. 55. 1877. This is a neat pamphlet, containing a very interesting Historical Sketch of the Luth. Church in Va. Copies may be had for 25 cents by addressing Griffith Bros. or the author, Salem, Va.

Religion and Religionisms. Discourse by Dr. C. P. Krauth at the opening of the General Council, Oct. 10, 1877. pp. 32. 1877. A better text for this Discourse would have been, "*his hand will be against every man.*"

We have the indispensable *Almanacs for 1878.* By T. N. Kurtz. Severinghaus & Co., and Lutheran Book Store.

ANDOVER PUBLICATIONS.

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA,
Edited by Professor E. A. Park, D.D., of Andover, and others, will begin its Thirty-fifth volume with the January number, 1878. Price, $4.00 per year, in advance.

Sets and parts of sets at reduced prices.

"It has become almost a necessity for every minister of the gospel." — *Watchman and Reflector.*

"Has for thirty years been known, not only in this country, but also on the continent, for its scholarly contributions." — *The Weekly Review*, Scotland.

"One of the ablest and best Quarterlies published in this or any other country." — *Methodist Advocate.*

"The ablest of our religious Quarterlies." — *The Congregationalist.*

"Fills an important niche occupied by no other." — *Morning Star.*

"One of the most valuable aids to biblical students that comes from the press: is of permanent value. . . . Its ability and scholarship have been fully sustained in later years." — *Zion's Herald.*

"Representative of our higher scholarship."—*The Advance.*

"Certainly one of the ablest theological Quarterlies published." — *Reformed Church Messenger.*

"It stands in many respects without a rival in its sphere" — *Christian at Work.*

"The most valuable of our theological Quarterlies." — *College Courant.*

"It may be fairly said that it has no equal as a theological eclectic in the world." — *Springfield Republican*

"The king of all the Quarterlies"—*Independent.*

***Index to the Bibliotheca Sacra, Volumes I. to** XXX., containing a Topical Index, an Index of Scripture Texts, and a List of Greek and Hebrew Words. Paper covers, $2.75. Cloth, $3 00
Copies interleaved with writing-paper 75 cents additional.

"It is admirably done — far the best piece of work of the kind I have ever seen; invaluable to all who possess or habitually consult the most learned and important theological Review published in this country."—*Dr. Ezra Abbot.*

"If we were asked by a foreigner to name a volume by which we should willing to have American scholarship and theological research guaged, we should have little hesitation in naming the volume before us. For thirty years the Bibliotheca Sacra has stood unsurpassed, and on the whole, unequalled for exactness and copiousness of learning, for width, variety, and catholicity. . . . Any one who has the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, and this INDEX, has a library in which the most momentuous topics in theology and biblical literature are treated by the ablest writers in America and the world." — *National Baptist.*

Immer's Hermeneutics. Hermeneutics of the New Testament. By Dr. A. Immer, Professor of Theology in the University of Berne. Translated from the German by Albert H. Newman. Crown 8vo. $2.25

Dr. Düsterdieck, of Hanover, Germany, says of it: "It may be hoped that this work will contribute to the furtherance of New Testament exegesis as a corrective and as imparting force to it, since the author in every part of it exhibits thorough acquaintance with his subject, modesty, and a clear and cautious judgment. At the same time his pure love for the truth and the scientific objectivity of his attitude will benefit and appeal in a salutary way to those who like the subscriber (i.e. Dr. D.), represent the believing 'orthodox' (see Translator's Preface, p. vi.), or even the 'theological' exegesis which the author does not recommend."

A Guide to Reading the Hebrew Text; for the Use of Beginners. By Rev. W. H. Vibbert, M.A., Professor of Hebrew in the Berkeley Divinity School. 8vo. $1.25

Buttmann's N. T. Grammar. A Grammar New Testament Greek. By Alexander Buttm Authorized Translation by Prof. J. Henry Th With numerous additions and corrections b Author.

"This Grammar," says Prof. Thayer, "is ack edged to be the most important work which ha peared on the N. T. Grammar since Winer's."

"In some respects we think the plan adopted his work an incidental advantage as compared Winer's."—*New Englander.*

"By far the most important work on this su which has been produced of late years."—*Am. J Review.*

Winer's N. T. Grammar. A Grammar o Idiom of the New Testament. By Dr. G Benedict Winer. Seventh Edition, enlarged improved by Dr. Gotlieb Lünemann, Profes Theology at the University of Göttingen. Re and Authorized Translation by Prof. J. H Thayer.

This standard work is complete in this ed It contains all the additions and corrections c author, and of his editor, in the Seventh Ge Edition; with a full Index of Principal Subje Greek Index, and an Index of Scripture Passag all over eighty pages of Indexes.

Gardiner's Harmonies of the Gospe

A Harmony of the Four Gospels in Gr according to the Text of Tischendorf, with lation of the Textus Receptus, and of the Te Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tregelles. Re Edition, with an Appendix on the Princip Textual Criticism.

"A new and critical Harmony of the Gospels pared with great care; with Notes, Parallel I ences, etc. Each column is clear and distinct, interwoven with another on the same page."

A Harmony of the Four Gospels in Eng A reproduction of the Greek Harmony in En By the same Author.

***Hackett's Commentary on the Acts.** A re of the last edition, revised by Professor Hac 8vo.

This most valuable work has been for some out of print, the plates having been destroyed i great fire in Boston. A limited edition is now pri

"We regard it as the best commentary on the that can be found in the English or any othe guage."—*Bibliotheca Sacra.*

Perowne on the Psalms. The Book of Ps A New Translation, with Introductions Notes Explanatory and Critical. By J. J. St Perowne, D. D., Fellow of Trinity College, bridge, and Canon of Llandaff. Reprinted the Third English Edition. Two vols. 8vo

This great work of Canon Perowne is now bro within the reach of all who wish to possess it.

"It comprises in itself more excellences than other commentary on the Psalms in our langu —*Baptist Quarterly.*

"I know no commentary on the Psalms w presents more fully and clearly, or treats on the more judiciously, the critical questions conn with the interpretation of the text."—*President Bartlett.*

"Very rare, indeed, is it that such a combin of requisites to a just exposition of Scripture are bined in one work,—such scholarship, such judg such taste, such spiritual insight, such wisdom general treatment of his subject, such skill as a lator, such simplicity and sustained vigor of st —*The Advance.*

By mail, postpaid, on receipt of the prices annexed. Send for a complete list of Andover Publicatio

WARREN F. DRAPER, PUBLISHER,

ANDOVER, MAS

CONTENTS OF NO. I.

—o—

Article. Page

I. The Allentown Church Case,..... 1

II. Relation of the American Colleges to Christianity,..... 65

By President James B. Angell. LL. D., of the University of Michigan.

III. The Augsburg Confession and the Thirty-Nine Articles of Anglican Church,..... 79

By John G. Morris. D. D., LL. D., Balt., Md.

IV. Prayer-Cures,..... 93

By Rev. George Scholl. A. M., Baltimore, Md.

V. Use and Abuse of Denominationalism,..... 101

VI. Interpretation of Philippians 2 : 6, 7,..... 119

Rev. H. Louis Baugher. A. M., Professor in Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.

VII. Literary Intelligence, ... 125

American.—Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Biographical and Historical—Miscellaneous.

British.—Biblical and Theological—Miscellaneous.

German.—Biblical—Historical—Practical—Miscellaneous.

VIII. Notices of New Publications, ... 128

Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature—The Origin of the World, according to Revelation and Science—An English Commentary on the Rhesus, Medea, Hippolytus, Alcestis, Heraclidæ, Supplices, and Troades of Euripides—Cicero's Tusculan Disputations—The Church of the Apostles—American Addresses—Light—Mesmerism, Spiritualism, &c.—Recent Polar Voyages—General Beckwith—The Teacher's Cabinet—Alpine Lyrics—On Poetic Interpretation of Nature—The Bodleys Telling Stories—The Mystery of Suffering—Monday Chats—Echoes from Mist-Land—First Lessons in Latin—Alcohol and the State—The Final Philosophy—Faith and Philosophy—Theological Essays—The Beginnings of Christianity—Boston Monday Lectures—Brighter than the Sun—Among the Turks—Lettice Eden—The Giant-Killer—A Peep Behind the Scenes—The Gospel Pointing to the Person of Christ—Jack O'Lantern—Blackberry Jam—Abide with me—The New England Ministry Sixty Years Ago—Go up higher—The Telephone—Elm Island Series—The Lucky Series—A Vocabulary of the Philosophical Sciences—Hermeneutics of the New Testament—The Encyclopædia Britannica—Lectures on Preaching—Nine Lectures on Preaching—The Old Bible and the New Science—Daughters of Armenia—A Miracle in Stone—Talks about India The Harmony of the Reformed Confessions—Notes on the International S. S. Lessons—The Little Pilgrim Question Book—The National Question Book—Sunday School Book—The Helper.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF THE

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

APRIL, 1878.

ARTICLE I.

A QUESTION TOUCHING THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

The question which it is proposed to discuss, in this article, is by no means one of vital importance. It affects no fundamental truth in doctrine or morals. Yet it has been given a fictitious importance, and has assumed a shape, that seems to demand more than a passing notice.

At the recent Lutheran Diet, held in Philadelphia December 27th, 28th, 1877, Dr. Conrad, in his paper on "*the Characteristics of the Augsburg Confession*," made the following statement:

"From the time the Confession was first sent to Luther, on the 11th of May, until the time of its presentation to the Emperor, on the 25th of June, it underwent constant verbal changes, and appeared in different forms of completeness in successive stages of its composition. And in this improved form it was sent to Luther between the 22d of May and the 2d of June, and again secured his unqualified approval."

The correctness of this statement was called in question, and the authority for it challenged. In the proceedings of the Diet, as published in the *Lutheran & Missionary*, the following appeared:

"Rev. Dr. Brown challenged Dr. Conrad to produce histor-

ical proof that the Confession was twice submitted to Luther before its publication (presentation). Dr. Conrad cited his authorities, and was sustained by Prof. Krauth."

Dr. Conrad gives his authority for his statement, in a note appended to his paper as printed in the authorized publication of the proceedings of the Diet. From this note it appears he relies on the authority of "*The Conservative Reformation*," by Dr. Krauth; quoting his statements from pages 227 to 233. Dr. Krauth also, in a tolerably extended note to the discussion on Dr. Conrad's paper, gives what he considers the proof of the statement as vouched for by Dr. Conrad and himself. This proof is the simple reiteration of what he had formerly published in the *Conservative Reformation.* There is no new evidence adduced.

We have thus brought distinctly before us the question of the reliability of these statements, made by Drs. Conrad and Krauth, for a second and third sending of the Confession to Luther, and his "*unqualified approval*" of it as thus sent, before it was submitted to the Diet: and this is the question which, so far as the evidence they furnish is concerned, it is proposed to discuss and, if possible, settle in this article. The burden of proof rests with them. It is not our duty to prove a negative. They have made and repeated the affirmation, and have pointed us to their authorities. It is with these alone that we have at present to do. If they have any other or better evidence for their statements it will be time enough to consider it when it is presented. For the present, they rest their case on the evidence they have submitted, and ask for a verdict in their favor.

It will be observed that Dr. Conrad depends entirely on the authority of the *Conservative Reformation*, by Dr. Krauth, to support his statement. Now, however learned and critical Dr. Krauth may be, he is not a very good personal witness for what took place more than three hundred years ago, and in this instance, we think, will not prove a very safe guide in examining the testimony of those whose authority must be decisive.

When the *Conservative Reformation* was published, seven

years ago, we pointed out what seemed to us very plain cases of perversion of testimony, and special pleading, leading to the most unwarranted conclusions. We ventured to call Dr. Conrad's attention to what we regarded as the utterly unreliable character of that evidence, and cautioned him against its use as authority to support his statement. We find no fault with him, however, that he has chosen to follow the *Conservative Reformation*, rather than to give any weight to our poor judgment in this matter. But we must be excused from believing without better evidence, and for presuming now to show how reliable, or rather utterly unreliable, the statement in question, as well as the evidence on which it rests, really is; and for telling Dr. Conrad plainly, that for once, at least, he has been sadly misled.

Did we not feel certain, beyond a doubt, in what we propose to say, we should hesitate to put ourselves in opposition to such authorities as Drs. Krauth and Conrad. Dr. Krauth has professedly made the Augsburg Confession a life study. He has translated and edited, what purports to be, a very critical edition of the Confession. It has been commended for "the labor, scholarly care, and valuable learning which have been bestowed upon it." The *Conservative Reformation*, which treats at length of the Augsburg Confession, professes such "*completeness as to render it unnecessary to refer to other works while reading it.*" This suggestion Dr. Conrad seems to have followed with becoming reverence and submission without even taking the trouble to verify the authorities cited. He may have been encouraged to this, by the assurance that the *Conservative Reformation* would be accepted as infallible authority, and whose accuracy it would be the height of presumption to question. With manifest reference to the strictures of this Review on the character of some of the statements and arguments, in the *Conservative Reformation*, our esteemed friend, Prof. H. E. Jacobs, in an appreciative and flattering review of the work says:

"In connection with this chapter, [that on the Augsburg Confession] we have carefully studied in the original the entire correspondence referred to, and can bear witness to the accuracy of every statement in the discussion."

We felt disposed, at the time, to call attention to the issue thus made, and to some very plain facts in the case, but have allowed the matter to rest until this new discussion has brought the subject to the surface again.

After such an array, it may seem a little hazardous to call in question statements put forth with so much assurance and sustained by such authorities. But truth is mightier than any man, and plain facts are more convincing than learned opinions.

We come now to the simple facts in the case. Has Dr. Conrad furnished any reliable evidence that the Augsburg Confession "*was sent to Luther between the 22d of May and the 2d of June*," and "that it *again secured his unqualified approval?*" Or has Dr. Krauth furnished any reliable evidence of its being sent, as he maintains, not only a second, but "for a *third time* before it was delivered?"

This is a simple question of fact, and which must be determined by the evidence in the case. We would prefer to follow the chronological order, and examine the evidence adduced as it is thus presented, but as we happen to know that Dr. Conrad relies especially on what *purports to be* a letter written by Luther to Melanchthon June 3d, 1530, we will dispose of it first: and that may prepare our readers for a more careful examination of the other testimony.

In response to the call for the authority for his statement, Dr. Conrad says: "*We accordingly refer to * * Luther's letter to Melanchthon of June 3d, as quoted by Dr. Krauth in his Conservative Reformation.*" He adds still further on in his note: "On the *3d of June*, Luther wrote to Melanchthon: 'I yesterday (June 2d) re-read your Apology entire, with care, and it pleases me exceedingly.'" For authority he refers again to the *Conservative Reformation*, p. 234. And the *Conservative Reformation* does contain this statement, referring to De Wette, No. 1,243; Buddeus, No. 137; and Walch xvi. 1,082, to support it. Precisely the same statement had been made by Dr. Krauth, in his edition of the Augsburg Confession, four years earlier, and the same authorities cited. This seems to be very conclusive, and we know with what confi-

dence and enthusiasm Dr. Conrad has appealed to it as triumphantly establishing his position. Luther says: "*I yesterday re-read your Apology entire*, etc." This was of course an entirely different reading from that of the 15th of May, when he returned it after his first reading.

But there is just one difficulty in the way of this testimony of Drs. Krauth and Conrad. It is however a rather serious difficulty—LUTHER WROTE NO SUCH LETTER AS THEY PRETEND ON THE 3D OF JUNE, *and there is not the shadow of a shadow of authority for their statement.* This may seem strong language, but is not an open question, or one about which there is or can be any dispute. Not a single authority cited by Drs. Krauth and Conrad pretends any thing of the kind; but all the authorities are agreed in placing the letter in question on the *3d of Juty.* Luther did write a letter, containing the language quoted, but instead of being written on *the 3d of June*—22 days before the presentation of the Confession at the Diet it was in reality written on THE 3D OF JULY—8 days after the presentation; and after, as we know and will have occasion to show, the Confession had been sent to him *subsequent to the presentation*, for his examination and judgment.

Of course we do not ask Drs. Krauth and Conrad to receive this on our mere assertion. But we ask them to examine any or all of the authorities which they profess to cite, and to produce any one that gives the least authority for placing this letter of Luther on the 3d of June, instead of the 3d of July. That our readers, who have not access to these authorities, may be under no doubt on this point, we desire to repeat, that there is and can be no question about the date of this letter—the evidence external and internal leaves no room for any doubt, and there can be none. The date of this letter is as well settled at that of the presentation of the Confession itself. The citing it as written on the *3d of June* is a plain, indisputable case of error, which admits of no debate or cavil. It is needless to cite the authorities, for they all agree, and it has never been a point of dispute.

It will be readily understood, that a letter written eight days after the Diet, and just one month later than Drs.

Krauth and Conrad give it, cannot be of any value in supporting their opinion. When Luther says: "I yesterday reread your Apology," instead of interpolating June 2d, as is done, it should be July 2d, and July 2d does not come "between the 22d of May and the 2d of June." So this letter of Luther, to which the date June 3d has been conveniently fixed, will serve no purpose in proving Luther's approval of the Confession *prior* to its presentation, after a second or third sending. The "*unqualified approval*" which is thus claimed for the 3d of June, turns out to have been given *after* the Diet, on the 3d of July.

It is not our business to offer any explanation of this very palpable mistake, and almost ludicrous use made of it to prove a pet theory. The most charitable supposition would be, that it was originally a blunder such as almost any one, who is not very careful, might make. But as it was thus published in the edition of the Augburg Confession, in 1868, repeated in the *Conservative Reformation*, in 1872, and now used in a grand Lutheran Diet in the city of Philadelphia, in 1877, and published in the proceedings, after the statement in part based on it had been publicly challenged, if it is not a 'blunder worse than a crime,' it is one, whose continued repetition admits of no apology or defence. We have determined, at least, to do what we can to stop its repetition, if we cannot correct the blunders of the past. It may be too much to expect that those who have been thus active in giving currency to this blunder to support a lame conclusion, will show the same zeal in correcting the impression thus falsely made by it; but it is not too much to ask that this blunder, of years' standing, shall not continue to be repeated in books and other publications, which claim the confidence of unsuspecting readers.

Before leaving this point, it may be proper to state that Melanchthon wrote to Luther on the 26th of June, the day after the presentation of the Confession, and says: Cæsari est exhibita defensio nostra, quam tibi mitto legendam, "Our Confession has been presented to the Emperor, which I send to

you that you may read."* On the very next day, he writes to Luther again and says: Nostra Confessio est exhibita Imperatori, exemplum etiam tibi misimus, quod apud te retinebis, ne emanet in publicum. "Our Confession has been presented to the Emperor, a copy also I have sent to you, which you will retain, ect."† On the same day writing to Vitus Theodorus, who was with Luther at Coburg, he begs that he will let him know Luther's opinion about it. Sed de ea re Doctoris judicium mihi rescribe. It is of this copy of the Confession, sent to Luther June 26th, after the presentation to the Emperor, that Luther writes, July 3d—"I yesterday re-read your Apology entire with care, and it pleases me exceedingly."

As there is no question, and never has been, about the dates of these letters, this, we think, will settle Drs. Krauth and Conrad's letter of the *3d of June.* There is no such letter of that date, and the citing of it so often, and now again in the printed proceedings of the Diet, to prove their point, we leave them to explain as best they can. We know, and our readers now may know, that this part of the evidence is not simply of no value, it is no evidence at all, as such a letter *of that date* has no existence.

We come now to the second part of their evidences: and this is about as reliable as this letter with the fictitious date of June 3d. It has indeed the advantage that what there is of it, is real. The argument is based on what Melanchthon himself says about the Confession. Dr. Krauth, in his note in the proceedings of the Diet, p. 238, says: "The evidence relied upon [for a *third* sending] is Melanchthon's own statement;" and then refers to the same authorities as given in the *Conservative Reformation.* He simply repeats and emphasizes certain points—and strangely enough, as we shall show, some of the points emphasized with *italics* are not at all in Melanchthon's statement. We quote Melanchthon's own words. Praesentibus Principibus et aliis gubernatoribus et

*Corpus Reformatorum, vol. II., No. 741.

†Corpus Reformatorum, vol. II., No. 745.

concionatoribus disputatum est ordine de singulis sententiis. Missa est deinde et Luthero tota forma Confessionis, quae Principibus scripsit, se hanc Confessionem et legisse et probare.

Dr. Krauth, followed by Dr. Conrad, argues that the sending of the Confession referred to in this statement of Melanchthon, and its approval by Luther, are "wholly distinct from Luther's indorsement of the Confession as sent May 11th, for that was not the '*tota forma*,' but relatively unfinished; that had not been discussed before princes, officials, and preachers, for they were not yet at Augsburg."

A real feat is exhibited in the way of translating and commenting on this language of Melanchthon. It is divided into several distinct sections, and the material part thus translated. "It was discussed and determined upon in regular course sentence by sentence. The complete form of the Confession was subsequently sent to Luther, who wrote to the Princes, that he had read the Confession and approved it."

It is by no means certain that *de singulis sententiis* means "sentence by sentence." It may mean, and probably does, concerning each opinion, or subject, or point. It is quite certain, however, and does not require a very profound knowledge of Latin to know thus much, that *disputatum est* cannot have as its direct subject Confessio, and hence that Melanchthon does not say "it" [the Confession] was discussed and determined upon." The verb is impersonal, and the meaning simply is 'there was discussion in order on each opinion or point,' or as Dr. K. translates, "sentence by sentence." Where the "*and determined upon*" comes from, we are not informed, and are at a loss to conjecture. When it is repeated, as it is, the words are italicised thus: "It was *discussed* and *determined upon* etc." Then we have it, italics and additions, "It was sent *after* the *discussion* and *determination of it* in regular order, article by article as it came, and sentence by sentence before and by princes, officials and theologians." Diet p. 240. If it is meant, after the fashion of our English Bibles to indicate by italics, that the words have been interpolated by the translator, and are no part of Melanchthon's

text, very well; but we suspect this is not the design, nor will the reader so understand it. We have thus interpolated into Melanchthon's statement, "*determined upon, article by article as it came . . by,*" without the shadow of authority in the original. It is however important to the author's purpose, and these six words of Melanchthon—disputatum est ordine de singulis sententiis—are made to do good service in the cause. But even after putting into the translation of Melanchthon's statement twice as much as it really contains, and emphasizing the spurious additions, it will not sustain the argument or warrant the conclusion.

It will be noticed that the argument hinges on two points —'the princes, officials, and preachers not yet being present at Augsburg, May 11th,' and the Confession not yet being "*tota forma.*" Dr. Krauth says: "Up to May 11th, the Elector (with his suite) was the only one of the Princes at Augsburg. On the 12th, the Landgrave of Hesse came; on the 15th the Nurembergers. Not until after May 22d did that conference and discussion take place, of which Melanchthon speaks." This he reiterates in his note in the discussion on Dr. Conrad's paper: "John of Saxony, up to May 11th (with his suite) was the only one of the princes at Augsburg."

Now, to the superficial or unsuspecting reader, this looks quite conclusive. The discussion was "in the presence of the princes and other officials, and of the preachers," and yet "up to May 11th, the Elector (with his suite) was the only one of the Princes at Augsburg." How then could the discussion have been in their presence, if not yet there? This is Dr. Krauth's inquiry which is to confound opposition.

But that very innocent looking "*with his suite,*" in parenthesis to hide its real significance, will disclose facts which utterly destroy that part of the argument. That "*suite*" of the Elector, that is made so small as to need a parenthesis to hold it, really included quite a number of "the princes, and other officials, and of the preachers." Let us see. It included a majority of the princes who actually signed the Confession, well on to a hundred of the nobility, with the most

distinguished theologians and officials. Dr. C. F. Schaeffer, in an article in the *Evangelical Review*, vol. x., p. 488, says: "The Elector was attended by an imposing retinue, consisting of NUMEROUS PRINCES *and noblemen.*" Walch, Intro. in Lib. Sym. pp. 166, 167, says: "The Elector, John of Saxony, took with him his son, John Frederick, Francis Duke of Luneburg, Wolfgang Prince of Anhalt, and not to enumerate the counts, barons and other nobles, his theologians, Martin Luther, George Spalatin, Justus Jonas, Philip Melanchthon, and John Agricola, the last named being in the train of Albert, Count of Mansfield." Luther was left at Coberg. Coelestinus, giving an account of the entrance into Augsburg, after mentioning by name the leading Princes as already enumerated, adds et aliis nobilibus viris ac equitibus centum et sexaginta, etc. As the "*suite*" of the Elector, mentioned with this indifferent air, and shut up in a parenthesis, actually *contained a majority of the Princes who signed the Confession*, with noblemen, chancellors, theologians, and other officials, it is very strange that the effort should be made to create the impression that "*Princes, officials and preachers were not yet at Augsburg.*" The fallacy of this part of the argument is too transparent to need any further exposure. There were "Princes and other officials and preachers" at Augsburg, whenMelanchthon wrote his letter of the 11th of May, and they had been there for ten days. The subject of the Confession to be presented had occupied their attention. This we know on the most reliable authority.

So much for no princes being at Augsburg, at that date, except the Elector.

The other point on which the argument is based—the expression "*tota forma*," which is made to mean "complete," "finished"—yields as little support to the conclusion sought to be drawn from it. Indeed, we know beyond any dispute, that if it is to be interpreted in the sense of "*finished*," that is completed, as Dr. Krauth argues, it was not thus finished on the 22d of May, nor on the 3d of June, nor at any of the dates named, prior to the very time of its presentation. Melanchthon went on improving and *finishing* to the very last.

Dr. Conrad's date, "between the 22d of May and the 2d of June," would find it still unfinished. Taking that letter of Melanchthon, May 22d, and admitting all that is claimed about its being sent, and received, and answered—of which more by and by—yet it would not be the finished Confession that Dr. Krauth insists on having sent. There is no agreement in this respect between Dr. Krauth and Dr. Conrad. One of them claims a second sending, the other a third.

But *tota forma* does not refer so much to the finish or completeness of the work, as the entirety or totality of the document, its plan or structure. We are sorry to have to differ so often from Dr. Krauth on mere questions of the meaning of words, or translation of simple Latin, but we should like to know where he found any such meaning as *finished* for "tota." We venture to say that "*finished*" or "*completed*," in the sense assigned to *tota*, is quite foreign to the meaning of that word. Totus expresses the *whole*, in opposition to a *part*, and not "finished" in opposition to "*unfinished*." And this agrees with the facts in the case. Müller, in his introduction to the Symbolical Books, calls attention to the fact, that the Elector, in sending the Confession to Luther on the 11th of May, refers to the "*Controverted Articles*," and that these were included. So it was not simply the *doctrinal articles*—articulos fidei—but the controverted articles also, or articles concerning which there was dissension, in a word, the *tota forma* of which Melanchthon is speaking, and which he says was sent to Luther. Thus the facts and the words employed harmonize, and confirm each other.

But we have authority which ought to have weight in this argument—that of Dr. Krauth himself, and that of Dr. C. F. Schaeffer, for applying the terms "*finished*" and "*complete*" to the Augsburg Confession as sent to Luther on the 11th of May. In the *Conservative Reformation*, when reviewing Dr. Shedd's *History of Doctrine*, on this very point, the author says, p. 336: "This Confession, *when finished*, was sent by the Elector to Luther, by whom, without a solitary change, or suggestion of a change, it was approved, May 15th, one month previous to the entrance of the Emperor

into Augsburg." Now let the reader bear in mind, that "this Confession," which the author of the *Conservative Reformation* tells us in this place, "WHEN FINISHED was sent by the Elector to Luther, by whom it was approved, May 15th" is the identical Confession, which he and Dr. Conrad argue was not the "*tota forma*," *not finished*, and hence must have some other and subsequent sending to answer the phraseology employed by Melanchthon. At one time it is declared that it was *finished* on the 15th of May, at another that it was *not finished.* How is this? Dr. Krauth is opposed to himself. He uses the fact one way when replying to Dr. Shedd, he and Dr. Conrad use it another way in the Lutheran Diet. We must leave them to reconcile their own palpable contradictions about that *tota forma* of the Confession, sent to Luther May 11th, and meanwhile they must excuse us if we refuse to give our endorsement to an argument which they have used to establish directly opposite and contradictory conclusions.

Dr. C. F. Schæffer, in the article already quoted, *Evangelical Review*, vol. x., p. 486, says: "With the well-known answer of Luther, May 15th, which is given by all the writers before us, he returns the document, *which was the Augsburg Confession in its complete state*, stamped with the seal of his approbation." The italics are his own. Dr. Schæffer says not a word about another sending and "*unqualified approval*," after this on the 15th of May. Two things may be learned from this statement of Dr. Schæffer. First, that he understands the Confession sent on the 11th of May to be the *tota forma*, or whole Confession, and, secondly, that this approval of Luther, May 15th, is the only one that he alleges previous to its presentation to the Emperor. This he regards as *the* approval which Luther gave it. Contrary to the argument attempted to be drawn from Melanchthon's language, we have now shown, we trust beyond any reasonable dispute, that "princes, officials and preachers" were at Augsburg on and before the 11th of May, and that the whole form, *tota forma*, of the Confession was sent to Luther at that time. This destroys the argument based upon this language to prove a

second or third sending, and leaves it without the support thus claimed.

We have now examined another of the proofs of this second sending according to Dr. Conrad, third according to Dr. Krauth, and are quite willing to leave the evidence they adduce to every intelligent and candid reader. It is such, Dr. Krauth says, as "will sweep away all necessity for any further discussion on this point." He seems to think the proof in the case settles the question. But so far from convincing us, we shall be greatly surprised, if our readers capable of sifting and weighing testimony, can find in this anything deserving the name of proof. The argument is unsupported by a single fact drawn from a fair interpretation of Melanchthon's language, and is contradicted by Drs. Krauth and Schæffer's testimony, as well as by that of others whose authority might readily be adduced. If any are convinced by this proof, surely it must be because they are satisfied with "trifles light as air."

The last argument remains to be considered. This is based on Melanchthon's letter to Luther, May 22d. We are free to admit that this letter gives a better show of plausibility to a second sending of the Confession, or rather a part of it, not the *tota forma*, to Luther than either of the other arguments. But it is not such proof as would be accepted before any careful impartial tribunal, of the whole Confession being actually sent to Luther, and it does not afford a particle of evidence of its having thus received his "unqualified approval," or any other kind of approval a second or third time. Let us examine carefully and impartially this last proof, and see what it amounts to—whether it is sufficient to warrant their conclusion or not.

It is a fact which is not disputed that Melanchthon did write a letter, addressed to Luther, and that the date assigned is May 22d. In that letter he does express the wish that Luther would run over "*the articles of faith*:" Vellem percurisses articulos fidei, in quibus si nihil putaveris esse vitii, relinqua utcunque tractabimus. He says that he is changing many things in the Confession daily. Now it is admitted that Me-

lanchthon wrote such a letter, and expressed such a desire. But this is all, absolutely all, that can be proved. There is no satisfactory proof that Luther ever received the letter, and so far as we know, no pretence of a reply to it.

We care nothing at all about the theories in reference to the destination of this letter. We care as little for Dr. Krauth's theory as for that of Rückert, which he treats with so much scorn and contempt. It is a fact that there is doubt about Luther's ever receiving this letter written May 22d. Were there any positive or clear proof of its reception, this would have made theories about it not only needless but impossible, which, as is well known, is not the case. Some have supposed that it miscarried, or that it was purposely withheld from Luther: others treat the latter supposition as a base calumny upon the parties interested. Still the fact remains—there is uncertainty as to this letter having ever reached Luther; and there is more than uncertainty about any reply. This latter is not even pretended, and hence there is not a particle of evidence, in this letter of Melanchthon, of Luther's reading the Confession a second time and giving it his "unqualified approval." We have no reply of any kind whatever from Luther to this letter of Melanchthon.

In the other cases of sending the Confession, as May 11th, and June 26th, there is distinct mention of the fact. Letters accompanied the sending. We know the particulars, and we have the acknowledgment of its reception, and the reply after reading. Nothing of the kind in this case. Everything is uncertain. In the letter itself Melanchthon says nothing about the Confession being sent, as in the other instances. There is simply a wish expressed, and no more.

The letters passing between Augsburg and Coburg were quite frequent. They have been carefully preserved. Dr. Krauth says: "We have about seventy letters of Luther, written to Augsburg during the Diet, and we know of thirty-nine written by Luther to Melanchthon in the five months of correspondence, during the Diet, or connected with it in the time preceding." Among all these letters of Luther where is the one that tells us anything about the reception,

or reading, or approval of the Confession at this sending? We should be glad to have presented such a letter, and it would settle the question, but unfortunately no such letter or evidence of any kind has been produced.

The simple writing of such a letter on the 22d of May by Melanchthon, cannot of course be accepted as evidence that it was received by Luther, much less that he read the Confession again, and gave it his "unqualified approval." If Dr. Conrad had, during the Diet in Philadelphia, written a letter to Dr. Krauth in West Philadelphia, expressing a wish that he would run over his (Dr. C.'s) speech, but had received no reply, and had no evidence that Dr. Krauth ever received his letter, it would be assuming a good deal to say, that Dr. Krauth had read the speech and returned it with his "*unqualified approval.*" It would be a more reasonable supposition that his letter had not been received, or that for some reason it elicited no reply. This is about the case with Melanchthon's letter to Luther, May 22d. There is no reply of Luther to that letter, and how can it be cited to show his approval? Letters sometimes miscarry now, or fail to receive answers, and the same may have been the case three hundred and fifty years ago.

We know that bitter and grievous complaints were made by Luther of his not receiving letters from Augsburg, and of his being left in ignorance of what was going on. This is one of the well known facts in the history of the Diet. We could furnish several very characteristic letters illustrating and confirming this point—Luther's anger at not hearing from Melanchthon, and Melanchthon's pains to appease him. May it not after all be true that Luther never received this letter of the 22d of May?

But Dr. Krauth says, 'Luther did receive it, and that on June 1st he quotes largely from it.' If it were so that Luther quoted largely from it, this would be proof that he must have received it. We are sorry to be compelled again to call in question the accuracy of such a statement. We have this letter of Luther before us. It is the letter of Luther to Jacob Probst, Licentiate of Theology, Minister of the Word in

Bremen, June 1st. We have read it and compared it with the letter of Melanchthon. There is not only nothing in the letter that is given as quotation, but there is no mention of Melanchthon's letter or reference to anything he has written. He does tell him that 'he has now the state of things about as they are at Augsburg—that Philip (Melanchthon) Jonas, Spalatin, Agricola, are with the prince at Augsburg.' But nothing that professes to be or bears the character of a quotation.

The allegation that he "quotes largely from it" is based on certain verbal coincidences in the two letters, and which are given in the *Conservative Reformation*, p. 230. But we can present the very same or similar coincidences in other letters written from Augsburg to different persons about the same time. They are easily explained by the simple fact that they relate to things well known, and were repeated over and over.

But all the discussion about this letter being received is of little account; for if it was received, and Luther did what Melanchthon desired, it was only a *part* of the Confession, and not the whole—simply the "*articulos fidei*—he wished run over, and this is no "unqualified approval" of the *whole Confession* a second time.

Of the proofs offered by Drs. Conrad and Krauth, the *first* is based on a letter with a false date, and so is utterly worthless; the *second* depends on the denial of a plain fact, and a mistranslation of Melanchthon's Latin: the *third* has no solid basis to support it, and, if it had, proves nothing to the point. The whole is not worth the paper on which it is printed.

We are open to conviction on this subject. If Drs. Conrad and Krauth have any trust-worthy evidence to offer, the pages of the Review are freely open to them to present it. We have no interest to serve in this case but that of the truth—and if there is any evidence of Luther's repeated reading and approval of the Confession before its presentation, we shall be glad to have it furnished. But we still wait for the proof.

Errata.—*quae* for *qui*, p. 168, line 2; *t* for *l*, p. 165, line 15.

ARTICLE II.

NEUROLOGY AND THE HUMAN SOUL.

By Prof. W. H. Wynn, Ph. D., State Agricultural College, Ames, Ia.

It is the tendency of all materialistic systems to contract the true measure of the soul, and, in certain cases, aside from its acknowledged value in some large aggregate of mind, to reduce its personality almost to a blank. Mr. Tyndall, in an address recently delivered at the Midland Institute, in the city of Birmingham, England, sagely distributed all the powers of the soul into the physical and physico-chemical forces of which the body is composed, and gently waved the old-time conception of a self-conscious ego to the realm of myth. "Adequate reflection," he says, "shows that the hypothesis of a free human soul, instead of introducing light into our minds, increases our darkness." We may entertain the conception in accommodation to the unscientific habits of the times, but at last we must come to know that it is a poet's dream. So understood he will not object. "If you are content to make your soul a poetic rendering of a phenomenon which refuses the yoke of ordinary mechanical laws, I, for one, would not object to this exercise of ideality." And then, at last, in what assumes to be the latest discoveries of the physiological school, we have Mr. G. H. Lewes, their most sanguine expounder, in his Phyiscal Basis of Mind, putting down both soul and body as mere abstractions covering concrete experiences, which science can apprehend only as the tremor of the nerves, but which we are required, by some sort of verbal legerdemain, to translate into the operations of the mind. It is time, therefore, that we should reassure ourselves of the true measure and inherent greatness of the soul, and ascertain, if the data be on hand, wherein the broadest generalizations of biology are destined to fail.

THE SEA WITHIN.

Max Müller traces our English word *soul* to an old Gothic original, meaning the *sea*, and infers that our Teutonic ancestors must have "conceived of the soul as a sea within, heaving up and down with every breath, and reflecting heaven and earth on the mirror of the deep." However this may be, there is a pre-eminent beauty and propriety in representing the soul under the figure of a sea. The larger portion of the earth's surface is given up to the dominion of the waters, and to one standing on the beach, the ocean, stretching far away into the dim solitudes of the distance, becomes a symbol of immensity scarcely less impressive than the sky in which it is lost. For the time being, the dry land shrinks in comparison, and the lofty mountains are a very little thing. In like manner are we always impressed with the vastness of the soul, when we look pensively within, and see our own spiritual horizons dissolving forever into the bosom of the Infinite, or over the history of mind, rolling up its unmeasured accumulations, in science, and art, and civilization, and song. Then the sea has its tides and currents, pouring incessantly through all latitudes of the watery expanse, the booming billows meanwhile leaping to the moon, and then breaking away in receding eddies, round all continents and islands, from pole to pole. So there are vast undercurrents of emotion and sweeping tides of passion, which indicate what fathomless depths there are to the human spirit, and how frail these fleshly barriers are, when the inner forces are lashed into a tempest.

Perhaps, as our myth-loving ancestors represented the sky as God, and the sea seemed to them to come pouring forth from its illimitable azure, and rolling back again into it, it would be an easy transfer, a kind of natural metaphor, to figure the soul of man as in like manner related to God. Even to the cultured vision the sea is, next to the sky, the most impressive symbol of immensity that is anywhere to be seen, the

——— "glorious mirror, where the Almighty's form
Glasses itself in tempests; in all time,

Calm or convulsed, in breeze, or gale, or storm,
Icing the pole, or in the torrid clime
Dark-heaving;—boundless, endless, and sublime,
The image of Eternity—the throne
Of the invisible"—

so there is something closely analogous to this in the far-reaching, illimitable stretches of our inner being, which renders thought or mind as nearly akin to the Deity, as the ancients conceived the sea to be to the sky.

CONSCIOUS SUPERIORITY TO NATURE.

Let us get some impregnable position in the acknowledged vastness of the spiritual powers of the soul. We cannot, indeed, measure the mental energies, as we would measure the mighty forces and stupendous magnitudes of the physical world, yet we need not hesitate to say that the mind of man is immeasurably vaster than all these forces and magnitudes combined. In a sense unquestionably true it may be said, that every man carries within himself a measure of being, inconceivably greater than that which is concentrated in all the suns and all the stars with which this physical universe is teeming. And that this may not be set aside as the empty language of compliment, in which human vanity is so eager to be flattered, let us adduce a few propositions that will make it clear.

First, then, however vast these physical forces may be, the soul of man is destined to have them in subjection, either as objects of knowledge, or as instruments of use. Now, beyond all question, it requires more being to subdue, than to be subdued. The mind of man is evidently making the conquest of this world. And it is a remarkable fact that all those modern theories of human nature, that make man only a link in the chain of cause and effect, and insist that his mental powers are but the complex co-ordination of the cosmic forces we see about us, also urge that the chief end of man is to subdue nature to his behest. But how can he subdue nature, unless he be greater than it? Indeed there is nothing so settled in human experience, as that man can subdue nature, or let nature subdue him; and it is this peculiar

element in his being that we call the will, which gives him a glory above the stars, and confounds and stultifies every system that would resolve his mental powers within the mere generalizations of biology. The great and insuperable mystery which no formula of biology can solve is, that man *knows himself*, and knows that he is *free*, and will never more thoroughly *know that he knows*, or be induced to believe that he does not know, by any researches he may make into the structure of the brain. His consciousness must be finally his appeal and there is nothing of which human nature is so invariably and so essentially conscious, as its superiority to the natural world.

Science, here, seems to have fallen into the singular paradox of pronouncing the consciousness of freedom an illusion of the unscientific mind, and yet by no means assenting that it shall have no place in the economy of our beliefs. She would not cast it out. It is too vitally concerned in all the upward movements of the race. She aims, however, to apply to it the generalizations of biology, and make the mind superior to the other natural forces, only as complex and highly differentiated forces are superior to those more elementary and uncombined. Two are stronger than one, and ten thousand are infinitely stronger than two. So says biology. The forces co-ordinated in the brain differ not in kind, but in degree, from those which we know so familiarly in the physical world around us. They are more powerful than heat, or light, or electricity, or the vital energies, or the automatic combinations in the human frame, simply because they are more complex, and not because of any power of self-adjustment they may be thought to possess. They are more powerful, but not more free; and this is the correction which Science would interpolate in the popular belief.

Now the insuperable objection to this is, that the forces in the brain have the capacity of being stronger or weaker just as they choose; that is to say, they are not compelled to exercise their inherent power over the forces of nature, as they would be, if they were simply a higher development of those forces. We have this from a source that can no more be

questioned, than can the best established facts in the anatomy of the brain. There is a point in the recesses of rational being, to which the law of necessity does not apply; provided, of course, that consciousness has any right in the field; and no complication of neural processes can ever be made the equivalent of that which consciousness uniformly pronounces the self-determining power of the human soul. And so it must be held that the will of man, in its last analysis, sets off his spiritual being as differing in kind from all those forces with which physics and biology are conversant; and that it is a fatal short-coming of philosophy to seek the true measure of the soul in such unpromising fields.

THE CREATIVE ENERGY, WHAT IS THAT?

Again, the soul of man is a *creative* energy, and this is absolutely inconceivable in a power that is wholly under the dominion of cause and effect. Take genius, the spirit of discovery, the inventive faculty, any display of that creative power, whereby the human race moves onward and upward in civilization and culture, and, relaxing which, it will go back again into ages of the densest superstition and gloom—how could this upward *nisus* of the soul be set down in any category of nature's forces! What, for example, does genius do when it surprises and overpowers us with the marvels of its creations? A Michael Angelo, a Beethoven, a Newton, a Shakespeare, what do these minds do, that so lifts them above their fellows, and so powerfully impresses the world with the exceeding grandeur and vastness of the soul? The answer to this will indicate specifically the insurmountable obstacle to every possible biological solution of the mind. Newton does, on a large scale, that which every mind, even of the lowest grade, is every day doing in an elementary way; and, on a small scale relatively, that which God himself is always doing in creating and maintaining the worlds, to wit, putting together elements and conceptions in such juxtaposition as they could not of themselves assume. That is creating. That is initiating a new development in nature;

but all minds are doing this; and that is specifically the insoluble mystery of the mind.

Take an illustration. Astronomers for many long ages were satisfied with gazing upon the stars with the naked eye. Then, in some way we cannot recover from the past, the art of making glass was discovered. Further on, as the laws of light and vision were studied, lenses were invented; and the mirror, known to men from the earliest dawn of history, was made to serve important purposes in elementary optics. By and by, in the opening of the seventeenth century, one Lippersheim, a Dutch astronomer, after long brooding over the matter in the silence of his laboratory, conceived the idea of putting together the object mirror and the eye lens, and immediately the telescope was born. It had, indeed, to pass on to the hands of Galileo, and Newton, and Herschel, before the great, complex, and powerful instrument we now have could be completed; but, neither for Lippersheim nor Herschel, was the mental process essentially different from that whereby the first lens was invented. In the one case, as in the other, it was the operation of the creative power inherent in man, in the exercise of which he brings together elements, which, otherwise, must forever remain apart. All minds are, to a limited extent, creative, and genius towers above the common herd only in its faculty for wider and more intuitive generalizations, and its greater executive capacity in bringing these out into realized use. But whether in genius or the common mind, this is the conscious endowment of the soul which our materialistic methods cannot grasp.

DR. MAUDESLEY SWAYS TO AND FRO.

Dr. Maudesley, in his exhaustive attempt to reduce the whole spiritual fabric to physiological formula, evidently feels the force of this omnipresent and confounding puzzle, and affirms and wavers, and wavers and affirms, almost in the same breath, as if so vast a mystery were at last to be stormed by some sort of word-stratagem, that would dismantle the fort without a fight. He says unqualifiedly: "Instead

of the mind being as assumed, a wondrous entity, the independent source of power and self-sufficient cause of causes, an honest observation proves *incontestably* that it is the most dependent of all natural forces. It is the highest development of force, and to its existence all the lower natural forces are indispensably prerequisite."* And then further on: "Without doubt the will is the highest force in nature, the last consummate blossom of all her marvelous efforts."† Then: "The highest action of the will is * * * truly *creative*, for in it is initiated a new development of nature; * * * If we ask whence comes the impulse that displays itself in this upward *nisus*, we can only answer *lamely*, that it comes from the same unfathomable source as the impulse that inspires or moves organic growth throughout nature." "Incontestably" and "lamely" are words of vastly different import, and yet they are used in different connections with reference to exactly the same thing. Shall he incontestably or lamely assert, and with what degree of confidence shall we believe, that mind is but the highest development of that "impulse that inspires or moves organic growth throughout nature?"

Then, moreover, how can we reconcile the declaration, that the highest act of the will is truly creative, in the sense that it initiates a new development of nature, with the other assertion, that the mind is the most dependent of all nature's forces, and cannot therefore be a source of power? To create is to originate, and that which is bound up in a rigid order of sequence cannot do other than flow with the stream. However much we must respect the scientific attainments, and intellectual superiority of Dr. Maudesley, it is nevertheless true, that this and that in his reasonings cannot be put together.

THE GREETING OF THE SPIRIT, "WHAT IS THAT?

But again, obviously, the powers of the mind are not limited to the brain. It is in the very nature of thought, that

---

*Dr. Maudesley, "Physiol. and Pathol. of Mind," p. 67.

†Ibid., pp., 188. 189.

it takes things in at a distance, and feeds upon the future as well as the past. And how is this done, or what is there in neural processes that can ever be an adequate explanation? From the days of Heraclitus down to the present time, the simple problem of bridging the chasm between mind and matter, has taxed the genius and learning of the ages to the utmost, and the points at issue seem to be as far off from adjustment now as they were on the day when they were first suggested. Empedocles thought that an efflux (ἀπορρόη) was emitted from the surface of sensible objects, which penetrated the pores of the body, and, mingling with the blood, gave us that subtle compound we call the soul. Then came Democritus with his theory of εἴδωλον, which is but the same sensible efflux, or image, this time reaching the soul through the channel of the senses. Aristotle's τό εἶδος is substantially the same thing, the effluent image of the external object impinging upon the organ of sense, and pictured there as the representative of the thing from which it came. I do not see the book before me, but a filmy image has floated from it, and found its way through the senses to my intelligent soul. In this shape, the theory was transmitted to the Schoolmen, and, through them, on to the very borders of our own time, with only, now and then, a reaction in favor of the self-activity of the mind, in imitation of Plato, when he made the eager spirit go out through the portal of the eyes, and gather up the images, and bring them in.

Down even to the days of Descartes, or more properly Reid and Kant, this theory of sense-perception prevailed. Under the destructive criticism of the great Scotch philosopher it was completely exploded, but the system of Common Sense left nothing in its stead. It is remarkable that, from that day to this, notwithstanding the stupendous labors of Reid and Kant, and Hamilton, and John Stuart Mill, and Bain, and Spencer, and Lewes, and all the great intellects that are now at work on this problem, there has never been propounded an adequate or satisfactory explanation of the common act of perception. We have now no settled *rationale* of how the

mind takes note of the external world. No doubt all agree that:

> "What sees is mind, what hears is mind,
> All things else are deaf and blind"

—but how does the mind see, how does it hear? This is a question upon which, in our own day, scarcely any two are agreed.

The mystery lies in the nature of thought. What is it, and how is it related to the organ in which it dwells? It is perfectly manifest that the physiological school is just as amenable to this mystery, as were the spiritualistic systems which they affect to ignore; and that the rigidity of their methods must keep them always farther away from a solution. Suppose Mr. Lewes should succeed in proving intellect to be a property of the brain, the most stupendous task is yet before him, to tell the world distinctly what the intellect is. What is that subtle power that runs so nimbly over all things, finding its way through ocean depths, and through the heart of the everlasting hills? What is that in the brain that is capable of mounting the empyrean, and roaming at will among the countless hosts of suns and stars, that float like baubles on the fields of space,—gauging their distances, and determining their buoyancy on the ethereal sea? What is this that can follow the backward current of the years to the awful silences of primeval solitudes, and read in the ripple of receding oceans the unfolding history of the great planet which gave it birth; or, forward to the issues and destinies which the future keeps locked up in its embrace? It is a property of the brain, is it?—but how much wider than the brain is the sphere of its operations! All this vast realm of being, of which it is a part, is its to know and enjoy; and the wider realm of truth, with which this physical universe is not commensurate, is the tenting-ground over which it marches from conquering to conquest.

"TO BE, OR NOT TO BE, THAT IS THE QUESTION."

This leads, naturally, to the deeper consideration of the vastness of the soul's being. Recurring again to our myth-

ological figure, the sea is vast, the sky is vast, but vaster yet is that ocean of being from which the souls of men are wafted to this nether world. The poet Wordsworth was gifted with almost prophetic insight into this portion of our nature, and in his Ode to Immortality, has given it a more condensed and powerful expression in words, than is elsewhere found in our language. Long may one pause on each line and figure of that remarkable poem, and still find an Orphic fulness of suggestion on themes too lofty for logic to touch. Truer than Science are these divinings of the poet, because they pour a flood of light upon a class of truths, from which Science is forever debarred. There are times of elevated consciousness for every one of us, "momentary gleams," when we have flashes of insight into the mystery of being, which no most plodding research could ever attain:

> "Hence in a season of calm weather,
> Though inland far we be,
> Our souls have sight of that immortal sea,
> Which brought us hither;
> Can in a moment travel thither,
> And see the children sport upon the shore,
> And hear the mighty waters rolling evermore."

When the word *being* is pronounced, it is no empty, meaningless, shadowy term we are using, under which to cover some blank, or illusive conception which our ignorance or our imbecility has conjured. Men look up into the azure concave above them, and, when the eye will reach no further, they conceive the limit to be a crystalline floor of blue; and for ages on ages all cosmological notions, and astronomical science, were built up on this illusion of the eye. There is no sky, and the word is used only in accommodation to the feebleness of our visual sense. On, and on, we must go, if we are on wing through space, and never find a spot beyond which we would not discover an infinitely vaster expanse than that we left behind. On, and on, forever, no end! no end! So, in the opinion of some, we have like barren intelligences, and deceptive words, in the imagined higher region of human aspiration and thought. *Being* is one of these,

and all those so-called higher verities, with which poetry and religion have to deal. As it was the office of science to take away the sky, and build up a true system of Astronomy on the actual immensity lying before it, so science will reduce this great matter of *being*, from the solid entity it is supposed to be, to the blank abysses of the Unknowable—in deference to the prejudices of men, spelling that word always with a capital U—and thus dismiss it practically from a place in human thought. The task, however, turns out to be a larger one than the great champions had conceived; already their first enthusiasm has died away, and the higher ideas remain undisturbed, like mountain ranges after the clearing of a storm, with their peaks lying serenely in the sky.

HEGEL AND THE MATERIALISTS.

It is noticeable how completely such systems must "cut the thread of history behind them." All the sublime speculations of the past, that proceeded upon the hypothesis of a spiritual entity called the soul, from Plato down, embracing the miraculous labors of the German metaphysicians right upon the heels of our own time, embracing Kant, whose labors produced an epoch in mind, analogous to that produced in politics by the French Revolution—all must be consigned to the "dead past" of Comte's metaphysical era, with scarcely *residuum* enough to fertilize the new fields, on which altogether new seed is to be cast. What matters it that vast systems were built up on this thought of *being*, we have now discovered that it was all moonshine and a dream, and the systems themselves have been rolled away like immense mountains of fog.

In the early part of the present century, there flourished in Germany a genius in philosophy, who, for depth of penetration, and grand, massive, almost miraculous, power of generalization in the phenomena of mind, probably never had his equal in ancient or modern times. It is no over-estimate of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel to say, that, in pure speculative capacity and vastness of comprehension, not even Aristotle or Kant could in any wise approach him,

although the final results of his labors are by no means so far-reaching or permanent as theirs. Now this man exerted all the power of his genius on the thought of *being*, *absolute being*, obviously an element in the consciousness of every one of us. Finally, he identified thought with being, and gave us that maxim which the world will not soon let perish, *that the real is the rational and the rational the real.* His theory of the identity of mind and matter in a substratum of absolute being, is a pantheism not unlike that of the great Spinoza, and, as such, not being in accord with the consciousness of the race, was inevitably fated to pass away. But *being* and *thought* were the two tremendous facts at the basis of his system, and if we are to have a *monism* in philosophy, how much better a monism of being, than a monism of neurological throbs!

Now imagine a materialist of our day, looking over a library of Hegelian literature consisting of several hundred volumes, and then turning contemptuously away to declare, that it is all an enormous waste of intellect on what, from beginning to end, is nothing but a figment of the brain. Prof. Draper has said as much. In his Intellectual Development of Europe, he boasts that he has made no mention of modern researches into the nature and attributes of the human mind, because all such researches have been totally barren of results. They have ignored anatomy, and were, therefore fundamentally false. He asks: "Of the great authors who have thus succeeded one another in ephemeral celebrity, how many made themselves acquainted with the structure of the human brain? Doubtless some have been so unfortunate as never to see one. Yet that wonderful organ was the basis of all their speculations. In voluntarily isolating themselves from every solid fact which might serve to be a landmark to them, they may be truly said to have sailed on a shoreless sea from which the fog never lifts."* This is a grave charge, that Kant, and Hegel, and Sir William Hamilton, and all that have studied consciousness deeply, and made it a tribunal of appeal, were

*Draper's, "Intel. Devel. of Eur." p. 578 et seq.

voluntarily isolating themselves from every solid fact, and sailing on a sea of fog.

But now let us ask, what more "solid fact" is there in all the range of man's knowledge than that of *being*, and what amount of scrutiny into the anatomy of the brain will throw the least particle of life on it? "I am;" "the world exists;" we act habitually on these postulates all the days of our lives; and we shall never be persuaded, by any amount of "honest observation," or speculative ingenuity, that we are walking in shadows, or conveniently courting the illusions of a dream. For me, and for all men, and all things, *being* is by far the most fundamental and "solid fact" which it is possible for the intellect to note, because substratum for, and inclusive of every conceivable phenomenon whether of matter or mind. It cannot be fully comprehended, we grant, but it lies broadly and deeply in our consciousness, and cannot be ignored. What forbids doing what we can with it, especially as, inseparably blended with it, is the larger consideration of the Supreme Being, the all pervasive Life, in which everything subsists. If my inquiries are to be confined to the anatomy of the brain, I shall not only have no answer on themes like this, but very likely the themes themselves shall be set aside, as having no rightful claim on the attention of man. What has the anatomy of the brain to say on all those deeper matters, which involve the moral freedom of the finite spirit in its relation to the Infinite? There is nothing in nerve-structure that is not fixed and invariable; nothing, that is, that is not strictly traceable to the inflexible order of conditioning causes and necessary sequence; and, therefore, a psychology resting on this physical basis will inevitably carry the law of necessity up into the region of the spirit, if, indeed, it find any such region into which to carry the law. For the most part the region of spirit virtually disappears; the old-fashioned *dualism* is wholly abandoned, or only so far retained as to signify the separate conceptions of bioplasm and force. The *me*, and the *not me* are sunk into the bottomless sea of negation, and nothing but the neural tremors are left. Every effort to grasp

anything deeper than phenomena, and these the grosser observations of the senses, is promptly condemned as transcending the legitimate range of human inquiry; and all high matters pertaining to God, and the finite personality, human freedom and destiny, are consigned to nescience, or labeled Theology, and flung to the dogs. Nevertheless these facts are of such infinite moment, and certify themselves so clearly to consciousness, that it is impossible to think of them as hushed, simply because they cannot be found in the anatomy of the brain.

QUEST OF BEING—FALSE REVERENCE.

For a moment let us consider how the mind must work on the fact of being necessarily involved in every word we use. "I am;" "the world exists"—if not intuitive, at least, with Hegel, we shall find that, on penetrating the concentric cycles of our consciousness, we must finally come to the great "I AM, the vast, shoreless, ocean of Being, "the immortal sea that brought us hither;" and, when fully launched there, no question of anatomy will embarrass our search. Thus: I am, and the world exists on which I live. Then there are other worlds, innumerable and effulgent, that sweep on forever through the fields of space. Now conceive of all these worlds as somehow ceasing to be, what then would remain behind? Let the scientist answer. He has inferentially satisfied himself of the existence of a luminiferous ether, diffused through all space, which, condensing in certain quarters, has become the nebulous flocculi out of which the worlds have leaped into being. Now let these worlds disappear, and there would be left only the eternal silences, the infinite solitudes, the *tohu va bohu* of the abysses of ether. We are at liberty to carry our abstractions farther, since this is confessedly the material out of which the worlds were made. Let the ether be annihilated in thought, and we are fairly launched on that shoreless ocean of Being, that vast all-pervasive Life of lives, which is back of immensity, and is the spiritual expanse out of which our grosser *aurae* took their rise. All matter being destroyed, Being as left, unless, indeed, the word itself is a

mere verbal abstraction, an empty logical *copula*, good only for tying together a bundle of phenomena, and useless when the bundle is loose.

At this last sad negation all our materialistic systems must inevitably arrive. Being sinks into an abstraction, and the Supreme Being disappears in a myth. They will doubtless always have something awful in reserve, some auroral glare to spring up from the dim regions of nothingness, or at best to fling a baleful gloaming round the abysses of force, but thought and purpose, as we know them, will not have their habitation there, and if one should bow in the attitude of worship, he would be obviously indulging a superstition or a trick. With Mr. Huxley the subject is approached in silence; and Mr. Tyndall puts his hands on his forehead, and bows prostrate before a mystery he cannot solve. We should always think charitably of the motives of men, especially when the solemnities of worship are in anywise involved. There is hallowed ground there, and ere we intrude, we are softly admonished that we must take the shoes from off our feet. But when men have practically annulled the great central idea in which all genuine worship must inhere, and then put on the air of devotion in the presence of that which is not, it is difficult to reckon on their silence and prostration as in any sense sincere. Men do not honestly worship the inane. To call *being* a word, not, indeed, the Eternal Word of God, which was in the beginning with God, and was God, but a mere expulsion of articulate breath, a verbal conventionality in the machinery of thought, with no answering reality in all the universe that can be lawfully set down as the thing it means, and then to profess reverence for such a word, and, get up a ritual for it, is a kind of *fetichism* known only to our modern times.

No! as Mr. Spencer has unwittingly admitted, the Unknowable, about which he has elsewhere uncompromisingly claimed that nothing can be predicated, is nevertheless a Power—"a Power of which humanity is but a small and fugitive product,—a Power which was in the course of ever-changing manifestations before humanity was, and will con-

tinue through other manifestations when humanity has ceas- to be,"* why did he not add, a Power akin to that which has its residence in the brain, intelligent and free?

MR. G. H. LEWES—HIS DISCOVERY IN MONISM.

And now comes Mr. Lewes, with a resolute purpose to remedy the weak spots in Mr. Spencer's system. Great expectations were aroused by the promise of what he was to do, but now, alas! when we have scaled the Pisgah of his system, no goodly prospect comes to view. He has simply let down the philosophy of the mind into the grossness of a *monism*, that has no call for the deliverances of consciousness, except in so far as those deliverances shall perfectly coalesce with the teachings of his neurological science. He appeals to consciousness. "Consciousness says distinctly "I am soul," "I am body," but it does not say "I am two things," nor does the fact of a radical distinction imply more than a contrast of aspects, such as that of convex and concave. The curve has at every point this contrast of convex and concave, and yet it is the identical line throughout. A mental process is, at every point, contrasted with a physical process assumed to be its correlate, and this contrast demands equivalent expression in the terms of each."†

Thus, in this "two-fold aspect" theory, in a convex and concave way, Mr. Lewes would retain the two sides of our nature, the same sentient experiences being apprehended objectively as matter, and subjectively as mind. "Mind and matter, object and subject, are abstractions from sentient experiences. We know them as abstractions, and know the concrete experiences from which they are abstracted."‡ There is no *noumenon*, no self, no substratum either of body or mind, in which those concrete experiences inhere; we only know that they are mental or physical processes, according as they are apprehended, "now under the modes of feeling classified as objective or physical, now under the modes clas-

*Spencer's "Study of Sociology," p. 311.

†Lewes' "Physical Basis of Mind," p. 377.

‡Ibid. p. 386.

sified as subjective or mental." "Let the example chosen be a logical process as the mental aspect, and a neural process as its physical correlate. The particular proposition may be viewed logically, as a grouping of experiences, or physiologically, as a grouping of neural tremors. Here we have a two-fold aspect of one and the same reality; and these different aspects are expressed in different terms." * But what is the underlying reality? Did it ever occur to Mr. Lewes to make this inquiry; or, occurring to him, did it not flash upon his mind that this was after all the only thing to be ascertained? Elsewhere he says: "The real is alternately the one and the other,"—then of course there is no stable real underlying the two sets of experiences, and it is an unpardonable solecism to speak of "a two-fold aspect of one and the same reality." Where is the reality? Is it the neural tremor, or the mental process; and if alternately one or the other, then what becomes of the two-fold aspect of one and the same reality?

Mr. Lewes is very explicit in laying down the postulate that: "All existence as known to us is the felt;" and we distinctly feel two classes of experiences, which we discriminate as mental or physical processes, according as they are subjectively or objectively apprehended. But who are *we* that feel these experiences? Did it ever occur to Mr. Lewes that this is specifically the problem to be solved? One may pursue neurological researches on the one hand, and mental processes on the other, in parallel lines forever, and gain not one ray of light on the problem proposed to be solved, viz. the relation of thought to the brain, or, as Mr. Lewes will have it, the identity of mental processes with the tremor of the nerves. It is interesting to know that we have two sets of experiences, and that they may be studied separately, but Mr. Lewes volunteered to show us how these two sets of experiences inhered in our subject. What now must be our disappointment when at last we are given to know that there is no underlying reality, no subject, no person by whom

* Lewes' "Physical Basis of Mind," p. 386.

these experiences are felt? To say that feeling, in itself, is the ultimatum of our knowledge, is to charge a word with a degree of significance it cannot carry; for, beyond all question, experiences cannot be felt unless there be some one to feel. But has not Mr. Lewes labored everywhere, and with a surprising wealth of induction, to show that sensibility or, viewed subjectively, sentience, is the universal property of the nervous system? Ah! then it is the nerves that feel, and our subjective translation of these nervous affections into terms of mind was a species of juggling, into which we were betrayed, for the purpose of easing in upon us the repulsive proposition "that matter can think."

THE VOLUNTARY POWERS GO DOWN.

As might have been expected, all man's voluntary agency goes down under these neurological speculations of Mr. Lewes. For how is freedom or self-determination, in any shape whatever to be found by the most careful and scrutinizing study of the habits of the nerves? It is the boast of Mr. Lewes that he has recovered himself from the mechanical automatism of Mr. Huxley, but then his organic automatism, so far as it bears on the free personality of man, is not one whit better. It is totally subversive of a fact of consciousness as large, and as tremendously significant, as all the facts of physiology put together; and the presumption is, that the unfortunate conflict has arisen from the effort to apply the grosser formulas to problems they will not solve.

But hear Mr. Lewes: "There is no real and essential distinction between voluntary and involuntary actions. They are all determined by feeling. It is convenient for common purposes to designate some actions as voluntary; but this is merely a convenience; no psychological or physiological insight is gained by it; an analysis of the process discloses no element in a voluntary action, which is not to be found in an involuntary action,—except in the origin and degree of stimulation." Again: "All actions are reflex, all are the operations of a mechanism, all are sentient, because the mechanism has sen-

sibility as its vital property."* Then again, speaking of *willing* to avoid a blow, for example, he says: "The man acts thus because he is so organized that a particular neural process is the stimulus of a particular central discharge; and he became thus organized through a long series of anterior adjustments responding to stimuli, each adjustment being the activity of the vital organizism."†

It will not do to swoop down on such philosophy as this with the cry of fatalism, or other such hard names, without having carefully examined the scientific ground on which it is assumed to rest. Without doubt, if it is a genuine deliverance of science that we are automata, and not in any sense free, personal, self-determining agents in the world, we should at once relinquish all "theological bias," and welcome the teaching, without foreboding the overthrow of social order, or the decline of religion in its train. We are reminded that truth is able to take care of itself. If science says authoritatively: "All actions are reflex;" "There is no real and essential distinction between voluntary and involuntary actions"—in other words, with Mr. Hæckel: "The will is never free," why, we need not torment ourselves on the possible collapse of human responsibility, and the coming on of a fearful moral night that will blot out the day. Science is to be trusted, and no one can be more confident of the future than he who will follow submissively in her lead. But the revolt against such doctrine is so universal and instinctive, because of the indefeasible prerogative of consciousness to be held as a factor in all such matters, that we cannot refrain from pronouncing the oracles we hear to be either deceptive or premature.

No one can help admiring the resources of Mr. Lewes, the patience and heroic devotion he exhibits in the tedious detail of experiment and induction, his intelligent grasp of the stupendous biological discoveries that are crowning our own time, and withal his power of generalization, though in a hopeless attempt. The nervous system seems a field pre-

---

*Ibid., pp. 422, 423. †Ibid., p. 448.

eminently his own. But, then, alas! the high promise which his new theory of vital automatism aroused, has been kept to our ear, but broken to our hope. Almost before it is formulated it is seen a thing that ought to be eschewed. It wants the prestige of a confident paternity. The new discovery in monism, which was to exempt it from the insuperable objections to all kindred systems in the past, is timidly, hesitatingly, periphrastically, and vaguely announced, and at last the great discoverer himself seems almost to abandon it as it struggles into life. What shall we make of his speculations, and with what tone of authority can they be promulgated, when installed with the following remarkable confession: "When we reflect how completely the modern views of the nervous system, and of the physiological, pathological, and psychological, explanations based on these views, are dominated by the current notions of the nerve-cell, it is of the last importance that we should fairly face the fact, that, at present, our knowledge even of the structure of the nerve-cell is extremely imperfect; and our knowledge of the part it plays—its anatomical relations, and its functional relations—is little more than guess-work."* A frank acknowledgment, but strangely inconsistent with the confident and imperious tone in which the conclusions of this school are generally announced! The truth is Mr. Lewes has seen, as all others have seen, that Mr. Spencer's method of the molecular study of the brain was too jejune to yield any fresh contribution to the science of the mind, because the vital organism was swallowed up in the all-devouring mechanism of the scheme; and so he pushed forward his neurological speculations, for the purpose of making the vital organism reveal what physics and chemistry would not disclose. But the abiding difficulty is to study the vital organism in a vital way. The work for the most part has to be done on dead or dying nervous tissue, and against the obscuring effect of clumsy preparation. "So great and manifold" says Mr. Lewes "are the difficulties of the search, that, although hun-

*Ibid. pp. 269, 270.

dreds of patient observers have, during the last forty years, been incessantly occupied with the elementary structure of the nervous system, very little has been finally established. Indeed we may still repeat Lotze's sarcasm, that microscopic theories have an average of five years duration."

Against this barrier all materialistic systems must chafe and beat their wings in vain. It is a lesson which the scientific men of our century must sooner or later learn, that the functional activity of the brain, in relation to thought can never be fully determined, except through consciousness co-ordinating the most exhaustive physiological search; that the living here must supplement the dead; that the direct study of the movement of that organ when alive cannot be done by anatomical methods at all; that for the living laws of its working, not simply "the total consensus of all the functions" is required, but the total concensus as apprehended in consciousness, and that, therefore, consciousness may supply a class of living facts that neurology cannot know. They must at last see, that, if there is a collision between the teachings of neurology and the universal and irrepressible instincts of the soul, it is because of the dead man, tied to the shoulders of the strong living one, when he would rise up and equip himself for the race.

QUAE NOCENT DOCENT.

We arrive at the conclusion, that every effort to resolve the mystery of the human soul, by means of physics or physiology, is fated to fail, because it is in the nature of these methods to antagonize the freedom of the will. If we are to quit our old metaphysics, and take up some form of automatism, whether it be the mechanical system of Spencer, Huxley and Tyndall, or the less frigid formulas of the great neurological school, of which Mr. Lewes is by far the most advanced representative,—in any case we are compelled to surrender the deeply inbred, and strangely persistent conviction, that somehow we were made to be free. Automatism and fatalism are, in the end, synonymous terms. The dominance of such systems implies the practical arrest of all the *free*

forces, which have been at work in the upward movement of the race, in civilization and religion, in discovery and art; and if it be under the overshadowing auspices of science that this slow and insidious abrading of the foundations of virtue and heroic effort is going on, is it any wonder that it should feel the force of the instinctive recoil of the better impulses of men? If science and fatalism are one and inseparable, then, of course, the overthrow of both is already decreed. But we have no such conception of science. It is only when she flounders in the dark that she comes upon so unseemly a companion. We hear much of the conflict of science and religion. But who is it that provokes it? Automatism and religion are forever at war; for if man be not free, responsibilty is gone, and religion sinks away into a superstition or a cheat. Meantime there is honey in the carcass of the lion. The prodigious efforts these schools are making to push their way into the adytum of the human soul, have been rewarded by some of the most splendid and beneficent discoveries of our modern times, and great reforms and schemes of amelioration have spruug up in their track. Nay, our indebtedness is greater. The exclusive methods of the old metaphysical schools must, henceforth, be forever abandoned; and, under the goading of the most destructive iconoclasm, the new time will find new instruments for defending all those loftier convictions which give dignity and grandeur to human nature, and which lie at the foundation of religion and the state. These convictions, in any event, cannot be given up. But in standing for their defense, it is high time that some new method be found, that will intelligently grasp, and generously estimate, the prodigious labors and grand discoveries of the those, who are plying the physical universe for whatever secret it may contain.

ARTICLE III.

A STUDY OF FRANCIS XAVIER WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO HIS REPUTED MIRACLES IN JAPAN.*

By Rev. Prof. W. E. Parson, A. M., of the Imperial University of Tokio, Japan.

The relations of Japan with the outside world, up to the present time, may be clearly outlined and easily remembered, by keeping in mind the three politico-religious incursions which have taken place within the historic period. In the sixth century envoys arrived from China, and shortly after came the first Buddhist missionaries. Confucianism, which can scarcely be called a religion, came into Japan about the same date. The new religions modified the native Shinto faith. The new letters were as eagerly adopted as are the western Sciences and Languages in our own day. Thus the earliest known invasion of Japan was both literary and religious in its character, and was purely Chinese.

The second incursion took place in the sixteenth century; (not in the fifteenth as a recent author incorrectly states.)† The Order of the Jesuits was founded during the general uneasiness of Europe in the sixteenth century, at a time when Rome was in trepidation through fear of the results of the great revolution inaugurated by Luther and others. Obedience to the head of the Church was made the corner-stone of this new society. The first command that came to Francis Xavier, (who with Ignatius Loyola may be considered the founder of the order,) was that he should proceed to the East to convert India and the regions beyond; Rome's object most probably being to balance by gains in the East the losses that seemed inevitable in Europe. John the Third of Portugal was also desirous of consecrating his military triumphs in

---

*A paper read before the Tokio Missionary Conference, in Tokio (Yedo), Japan, Dec. 4th, 1877.

†The Mikado's Empire, p. 84.

the East by spreading the gospel among the heathen. Francis Xavier's obedience was instant and complete, and he at once entered upon a voluntary exile, which was terminated—as in the case of many missionaries since—only by death at the post of duty. In the course of a long and toilsome missionary career, Xavier found himself led to Japan through the representations made to him by the Portuguese, and especially through the influence of one Hansiro, or Anjiro, a Japanese refugee, who had found his way to Malacca, and thence to India. This Anjiro, the first Japanese ever baptized, was given the name of Paul, and is frequently referred to in the letters of Xavier. Paul is said to have made the very shrewd remark, that it was a fortunate circumstance that no merchantmen came into Japan along with Francis Xavier. "If his countrymen," Paul of the Holy Faith remarks, "had seen on the one hand Master Francis preaching the holy law of God, and at the same time and place had also seen, on the other, the Christian merchant doing things contrary to the same law, they would have formed their judgment rather from the deeds of the merchants than from the word of the preacher, and would have asked Master Francis how it could be that the Christians looked forward to the good things of heaven after death, if they lived now as if there were no goods but those of this world? "He thanked God," he said, "that no European entered Japan along with Francis."*

The Japanese crowded about Xavier from the first moment of his landing, and though his missionary work in Japan did not extend over much more than two years, his converts were numbered by thousands, and it seemed as if the whole Empire might speedily be converted to the cross, as it had before readily yielded to the persuasions of the Buddhists from China.

It is estimated that when the edict of expulsion was issued (1613), there were more than two millions of Christian converts, whose spiritual concerns were administered by no

*The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier, By Henry James Coleridge, of the Society of Jesus. London, Burnes & Oates. 1872. pp. 164, 165.

fewer than two hundred missionaries, three-fourths of whom were Jesuits. Dominicans, Franciscans and Jesuits were vying with each other as to which should secure the most converts.

But a triangular quarrel unfortunately broke out after some years, in which protestants (Dutch and English), Portuguese, and Japanese were concerned. There is some doubt now as to who were deepest in the wrong, but a charitable judgment would perhaps make all alike sharers in the blame. In any case the end was most disastrous. The Japanese, whether stirred up against the papists by the protestants, or against the protestants by the papists, or by Buddhists against both, rose in fury against protestant and papist alike, expelling them all from the country, and instituting a series of persecutions against the native Christians, which resulted in an almost complete extirpation of the Christian faith. A table of rewards was prepared by the government, in which the price paid for the apprehension of those bearing the Christian name was gradually increased as their number diminished. The curtain falls on this second epoch with the terrible tragedy of Shimabara. Thirty thousand converts assembled in a single province, and unable longer to endure the fierce persecutions directed against them, they fortified the castle of Shimabara, and openly defied the Government. They were soon overcome and put to the sword without mercy. The details of this tragedy are revolting, and there are records of heroic martyrdoms that bring to mind the earlier centuries. In the light of these facts we can understand why Mr. Mori, formerly the Minister from Japan at Washington, should write of "the Christian troubles which cost our nation fifty thousand lives, without much benefit either to the sufferers, or the religion."* Then followed the edicts which sealed the country to the outside world for nearly two hundred and fifty years. To this day the influence of this second incursion is felt in Japan; there is a residuum of hate towards Rome,— a lurking jealousy of all

*"Education in Japan," by Arinori Mori.

missionary work,—which places the Christian Church, and especially the Church of Rome, in a far less favorable light than she would have been, if Christianity had never been heard of in Japan before the advent of Commodore Perry. A prominent Japanese scholar, now Vice Minister of the Educational Department says: "The reason which led our countrymen to dislike the foreigner at one time past was simply this,—that they could not forget the unjust intentions of the European settlers in this country three hundred years ago, who attempted to encroach upon our Empire." Mr. Mori, says:—"The impression made by Christianity upon the whole nation was so entirely a perversion of its real character and proper influence, that our people came to regard it as an evil power of superstition and destruction."

Rev. Mr. Stout, a missionary of the Dutch Reformed Church at Nagasaki, where this lingering antipathy to Christianity is perhaps strongest, says in a private letter in response to some questions addressed to him:

"The Japanese seem much less ready to come into contact with Christianity at all, on account of their former knowledge of it. It is stigmatized by the very worst names that the language can afford. We are much hindered in our work on this account, and the Romish Christians say there are no additions scarcely made to their numbers." This was the second incursion.

The third incursion was from America, through Commodore Perry, who broke up the seclusion of nearly three centuries, and brought Japan into treaty relations with the United States and Europe. With this new opening came a new literature, firing all the old ambitious desires of the Japanese for knowledge. Christianity also came, not as in the sixteenth century, through men scheming after religious control for political purposes, or after political control for religious purposes, but rather let us hope fully in the spirit of its Divine Founder, who said "My Kingdom is not of this World."

These are briefly the three great epochs in the history of Japan as she stands related to the outside world. My purpose in this article is to examine with some care one point

connected with the second of these epochs. This point is the claim that Francis Xavier was possessed of the power to work miracles, and that he made frequent use of this power while in Japan. It is claimed by the Church of Rome that Xavier did have this power, that he healed the sick, that he had power to visit blasphemers with instant punishment, that he had the double gift of tongue, viz: the ability to preach in tongues of which he had learned little or nothing, and also the power to cause his listeners to hear each in his own tongue. This investigation is entered upon, not because it is deemed a debatable question as to whether any miracles were ever actually wrought by Francis Xavier, but for other reasons which will appear subsequently.

Before proceeding further, a word concerning Xavier may be in place here, as to the sincerity and devotion of the man, which are manifest in his whole life, and breathe through all his letters. More than three hundred years have passed away since the death of Xavier, and still the story of his life has a deep interest for all who wish to study the history of Christian Missions. This interest has deepened through the recent opening of the Japanese islands to commerce and Christianity. Wherever we get an insight into the motives that ruled the man, from the first moment of his instant obedience, to the command which carried him forever from his native haunts out to the forlorn East, down to the day on which he died on the coast of China, we cannot but yield our tribute of praise to his complete unselfishness, we must admire the entire surrender made by this man of God who went forth in obedience, like Abraham of old, not knowing whither he went. All this need lead us to no unduly exalted reverence for Xavier, since the records of Protestant as well as of Catholic missions in modern times will furnish us with hundreds of names of men who have gone forth in the same holy spirit of denial to the same divine work, finding in the end the same glorified death.

We must not make the mistake of refusing to yield to Xavier his due; nor must we listen to those who would depreciate the men of our own day in comparison with him.

Xavier's own words will best show us the spirit of the man, and the considerations that led him to come to Japan. "When once," he writes, "I had clearly recognized in myself the intimation and conviction that it was altogether the desire of God, and that it was a matter which his service required, that I should go to Japan, I gave myself up to the plan so entirely and irrevocably, that it seemed to me that if I were now to desist from what I had begun, I should be more wicked and more detestable than the very idolaters of Japan." *

And again he says,—

"It is a great comfort to us to know that God, who judges the inmost feelings of the human heart, sees clearly with what wish, with what aim, with what prayer, and in search of what it is that we are moved to undertake this voyage to Japan."

And still further,

"There are two things which support me against all the threats and preparations of the devil, who is already threatening hostilities and letting us know clearly enough that he means war to the knife, in order to frighten us from our course. The first of these is, as I have just said, the conviction that God knows with perfect clearness the rectitude of my intentions in undertaking the voyage. The second is, the most certain knowledge of the entire and absolute dominion of the will of God over all created things, so that no one of them can do anything at all except by the permission of God." He then goes on to enumerate some of the dangers that actually lay in his path, such as ignorance of the seas to be traversed, with their dangerous quicksands, and hidden docks; the extreme violence of the most furious storms, and "the risk of fierce attacks from the pirates who infest those seas." All this lets us into the mind and intention of the man, and makes us think favorably of him; and recalling the wonderful successes that attended and followed his labors we need not wonder that the Church of Rome looks upon

* Life and Letters, p. 179.

Xavier as perhaps the greatest missionary since the days of Boniface, that saint and martyr who in the Eighth century undertook the conversion of Germany.

There is still another point I would hint at, without insisting upon it. It is, that as Xavier's life and times were thrown into that doubtful territory, which in a great conflict always lies between the two contending parties, we may in some special and rightful sense claim him as the property of the universal Church—the Catholic Church, in no narrow use of the word. Let me illustrate by our relations to Boniface to whom I have just referred. He is the property of the universal Church. His life lay within that period when no wide and vital division had yet taken place. His virtues, his faults are all the property of papist and protestant alike, since in the eighth century there was neither papist nor protestant, as we now use the terms. In much the same sense does Xavier belong to all the Church. He lived in the times when schools were forming, and the lines were beginning to be drawn. He was far distant from Europe during the hottest of the struggle, and knew not its meaning in full, nor could he have entered into its bitterness. His departure dates back to the most unsettled of those troublous days. It is not improbable that he and Calvin were together in their studies in Paris, but the departure of Xavier to the East at that particular time, joined with his complete absorption in his work, must have prevented him from ever forming any clear conception of the great revolution through which Christendom was destined to pass. He labored in harmony with the methods he had already learned, giving himself in devotion to the only Church he knew. We shall do him injustice to judge him, or his labors, apart from the time in which he lived. His method, honestly taken and conscientiously followed, were not always nor often such as we might now approve, but we must charitably recall the fact that he knew no other way.

Xavier was both a Catholic and a Jesuit; but he was a Catholic in the days of Luther, when it was possible for men to be so bewildered by conflicting opinions, as in the case of

Erasmus, or so hemmed about by indifferent friends, or so engrossed in their own immediate work, as in the case of Xavier himself, as not to be able to realize the greatness of the passing revolution. As one of the founders of the Society of Jesus, and as an intimate friend of Ignatius of Loyola, he belongs to that early period in the history of the order, when to be Jesuit was not necessarily to be possessed of that spirit which we can best describe in our time by calling it Jesuitical. For, whilst the name Christian, first given in derision at Antioch, has out-lived its original reproach, and is now a crown, the name Jesus, taken in pride, has outlived its glory, so that in common speech Jesuitism has become a synonym for the unscrupulous. We might therefore justly characterize Francis Xavier as an unjesuitical Jesuit, who went forth in consecration to carry what he believed to be a message of good-will to the most distant parts of the earth, in a time when distance was measured far otherwise than we measure it in our age of steam. Remembering these facts, taking into account the time in which he lived, and the conception of the Christian Church which prevailed in the sixteenth century, remembering also that the work to which Xavier was called left him neither time nor opportunity to deliver himself from the thraldrom of the system under which he was educated, we shall love not less the noble spirit he displayed in his self-sacrifice down to the day of his death. We shall see also that his own friends have done him harm, in forgetting, that truth, like beauty, is most adorned when unadorned, and that they could add nothing by their fabrications to the thrillingly interesting story of his life. It is with especial reference to this aspect of Xavier's life and motives that I propose to examine into the story of his reputed miracles. For if it can be shown, not only that Xavier wrought no miracles, but that he had no thought of any, never pretended to work any, never made any claim to have wrought any, we shall succeed in delivering him from the evil suspicion under which he seems to lie. His name will cease to be a thing by which to work charms, and we shall think of him who bore it as none the less a Saint, knowing that

he never lent himself either to "pious frauds," or dishonorable method, and never laid claim to the possession of Divine powers.

We are confronted then with the statement made by Jesuit historians and biographers, that Xavier wrought sundry miracles in Japan,—as also in India, that his testimony concerning Christ was confirmed, as was that of the early apostles, by signs and wonders accompanying it.* We are met by the further statement, which we should not probably be able to deny, that when the Saviour gave his last commission to his disciples to go into all the world, preaching the gospel to every creature, he also gave the promise that signs should follow them that believe. Mark, 16 : 17, 18. They should have power to cast out devils, to speak with tongues, to take up serpents, to drink deadly things without hurt, to heal the sick, and thus confirm the truth of their testimony. We are further told that there is no evidence that this power was withdrawn in the end of what we denominate apostolic times. It is claimed that the most of the miraculous signs above enumerated attended the preaching of Xavier, and it is further claimed that the fact, that such miracles as are here set down as seals of apostleship were actually wrought, is substantiated by full and ample testimony, of much the same kind as that by which the miracles of the New Testament are made worthy of our acceptance, the testimony in the former case being more valuable than in the latter inasmuch as it is sixteen centuries nearer to us. What shall we say to

---

*The Auditors of the Rota quote the "promise, [*Relatio super sanctitate et miraculis Francisci Xavierii*,] made by our Lord as to the signs which shall follow those who believe, and also they quote the words of St. Paul that tongues are a sign, not to believers, but unbelievers." "They end by arguing that it was highly probable that Francis Xavier would have had this gift, inasmuch as it had been given to the apostles to enable them to be of use to those to whom they were sent, and the power of being understood by many of different languages at the same time seemed necessary to them, so also as this servant of God was sent to the East for the salvation of its peoples, it seems to follow that as in other respects he had received the spirit of the apostles, so also in this respect he should be like unto them."—Coleridge, pp. 383, 386.

these claims? From a careful study of the evidence, and after a close perusal of all the letters written from Japan by Xavier, one must come to the conclusion, that not only is there no good evidence that Xavier ever wrought a miracle, but, which is more to the purpose in our present study, that he never once made any such claim, never mentions in the most indirect way any miracle, or any act which could be construed as miraculous. On the other hand we find that Xavier does frequently speak of many difficult, and some impossible, things which we should not expect to find as hindrances to one endowed with supernatural gifts. For example, in regard to the difficulties ordinarily encountered in the acquisition of a new tongue, we find that Xavier was not exempt from such difficulties. He never refers in any of his letters to any supernatural aid in either acquiring or using the new languages spoken by him. On the other hand, he frequently refers to the difficulty he experiences owing to ignorance, and alludes to himself as diligently laboring to acquire these languages. The biographer of Xavier says:—

"Francis Xavier was assisted by the peculiar gift of apostolic men like himself; his sermons were not those of a foreigner who had scarcely learnt the language of the country in which he was speaking, but he spoke freely, flowingly, elegantly, as if he had lived in Japan all his life. There is evidence also that at this time he preached fluently in Chinese to the merchants of China who traded in the port of Simonoseki. Another wonderful form of the same gift is also mentioned in the accounts of Francis while at Amanguchi, which reminds us of the manifestation of miraculous power on the day of Pentecost, when the Apostles spoke in one language and were understood in several. * * * When several questions were put to Francis at the same time by different persons in the crowd, he made one answer which satisfied all."

It does not require a great deal of discernment to discover the utter emptiness of all the arguments put forth by the Church of Rome, to establish Xavier's right to the claim here made in reference to him.

And, first, we must lay some stress on the fact that we know nothing at all about the character of the preaching of Xavier, beyond the hazy and untrustworthy traditions that have come down to us. We must also note the indirectness and indefiniteness of all the testimony in the case. In every instance the testimony comes at second or third hand, and never in any letter of his, or in any record made by Xavier himself. Our authority is always found in the accounts given by others concerning Xavier; and we can readily understand how such testimony might be prejudiced, perverted, or even manufactured. All this is to be borne in mind in connection with another important fact, which is that Xavier was a most copious letter-writer. He wrote down the most minute details of his plans and work, and was always communicating in a voluminous way with his Order, with his College at Goa, with the King of Portugal, with Ignatius Loyola, to whom especially he poured out his inmost soul, with Don Pedro de Sylva, Commandant of Malacca, and with many others. The consequence is that there are scores of his letters in existence, by means of which the whole life of Xavier may be traced in its minutest details. It is quite fair to ask whether it is possible that in all these letters, and especially in those dictated to Loyola, his associate in the founding of the Society to which he gave his life, pouring out his whole soul on other matters, entering into the minutest affairs connected with his arduous missionary labors, no mention should be made of the fact that his preaching was accompanied with signs and wonders? It would certainly be strange that a man possessed of apostolic gifts should speak of all his trials, plans, and successes, without ever hinting in the most distant way of any single miraculous sign attending his preaching. It would have been quite legitimate for him to have done so. The early apostles did so, and the record of their miracles stands in the same letters in which we read of their toils and trials, (Acts 19 : 11; 2 Cor. 12 : 12). The only conclusion left us, in the absence of any such allusion, is, that this whole matter of miracle-working

is so entirely apart from any record made by Xavier, and yet so exactly what we might presume he would have recorded, if he could have done so truthfully, that we must reject the tales as later than Xavier, and therefore a series of misconstructions, when they are not imitations, or pure fabrications.

Again, as to the second part of the miraculous claim, that many persons, gathered in one spot in Japan, should understand an answer given by Xavier to the various questions proposed to him; we need see nothing beyond the natural in this, if it were true. The people were of the neighboring provinces, and even had they come from more distant parts, the various dialects in the Japanese language are not so diverse as to render a foreigner using one dialect utterly unintelligible to those acquainted with other dialects. We may cite here a sample of the evidence on which the Church of Rome rests the claim of Xavier to apostleship and saintship:

"Another witness, examined at Goa, declares that he had heard from persons worthy of credit, and particularly from four brothers who had been companions of Francis when in India, that when he first went to Japan and knew little or nothing of the language, yet, though he preached without an interpreter, partly in Spanish, partly in Latin, partly in Portuguese, with a few Japanese words mixed up, he was understood by all as if he had spoken in the native language of each."

This is part of the testimony on which the canonization of Xavier was based. It is only necessary to look at it to discover its worthlessness as proof. Some one *at Goa* testifies as to what he *had heard* in connection with Xavier's work in Japan. The testimony itself, if it were worth anything, would prove nothing beyond the fact that Xavier must have made use of a strange medley, with Spanish, Latin, Portuguese, and "a few Japanese words mixed up."

Now, on going back to the original letter of Xavier on which the claim was first based, it would seem that a more careful reading of that letter would furnish all the answer needed to show the emptiness of the claim. It is a letter written by Xavier while he was yet in Japan to the Society

he left behind him at Goa. In this, as in all his other letters, there occurs no single word which could on the most liberal construction be made to bear evidence in favor of the assertion made by his biographer "that Francis Xavier was assisted by the peculiar gift of apostolic men like himself."

Viewing the matter fairly, in the light of all the facts, we can reach no other conclusion than that it is one of those conveniently exaggerated mistakes which has grown out of the extreme politeness of the Japanese, who would seem to understand the preacher, even when they did not; or else it is a pure fabrication, helped out by testimony manufactured subsequently, of which that prince of liars, Mendez Pinto, furnishes his due share.

If now we refer to the letter in question we shall find that it does contain very strong evidence on the other side. For we find in this letter that while Xavier makes no mention of miracles, and does not in any way intimate that he thinks himself possessed of miraculous gifts of speech, he does on the other hand refer to his own inability to use fluently the speech of the Japanese. He distinctly affirms that he has spent much of his time in trying to learn to speak Japanese, and he mentions the work of translating a certain book into Japanese as a "great labor," and closes by saying that he would not have been able to have accomplished these difficult tasks "if I had not had the work of these converts to help me." *

This ought effectually to dispose of the whole case, and show us that Xavier himself never meant to resort to subterfuges, either to build up a new order, or to prop up a decaying system. He as one of the founders of the Order of the Jesuits, was less a Jesuit than some of his followers, and his testimony is more trustworthy than that of some of his biographers. The precise language of Xavier, written on another occasion to this same Society at Goa, is significant:—

"This island [Japan] is well fitted and prepared to receive the gospel. *If we all knew the language, I do not doubt but that*

---

* Coleridge, p. 301. Vol. II.

a great many Japanese would become Christians. God grant that we may soon acquire it well! as we have already for some time begun to understand it."* The only meaning of which is, that he did not use it well, and understood it indifferently.

In another letter Xavier writes:

"If we knew the Japanese language, we should long ere this have been at work at this large uncultivated field with great fruit of souls. Paul [Anjiro] indeed has diligently preached the Gospel day and night. * * At present we are like so many dumb statues in the midst of the people."

One other point we are to bear in mind in passing. It is the fact that these letters of Xavier were sent back to Europe for a purpose. That purpose is indicated in one sentence that may be found in one of these letters:—

"Would to God that these divine consolations which God so graciously gives us in the midst of our labors might not only be related by me, but also some experience of them be sent to our European Universities, to be tasted as well as heard of!" It is in a line with this that he is led in one place to exult over his discomfiture of the bonzes in argument, saying "the most glorious victory over most formidable enemies was gained." Is it not legitimate to ask whether, if any more signal, because miraculous, victory, such as attended Elijah in his contest with the priests of Baal, had been added to this "most glorious victory over most formidable enemies," Xavier would not have recorded it in full, or in part, or at least have made some allusion to it?

The argument is purely inferential, but under the circumstances it has much weight, and leads to the conviction that not only was no miracle ever wrought by Xavier, but that he himself never claimed to have wrought any. This statement is made thus sweeping in order to cover the whole of his life and all his letters. There might seem to be one exception to this, in a letter written from India, in which Xavier records the recovery of a sick woman in answer to his prayers; but if we look more closely we shall find that he

* Coleridge, 242, Vol. II.

uses no language in that connection that would justify the inference that the cure was miraculous, or brought about by any supernatural power he may have possessed. On the contrary he speaks of it as a "*miracle which God had wrought.*" It was simply a case of recovery from sickness in answer to the prayer of faith, such as we are all familiar with, and commonly allude to in terms which, though they might suggest the miraculous, are well understood to involve no possession of supernatural power on the part of the petitioner. It is not peculiar to Rome to believe that the prayer of faith shall save the sick. James announced it in his epistle, (James 5 : 15), and the Christian Church has always professed to both believe and act upon the promise there recorded. Luther at the bedside of Melanchthon is a well-known case in point. After a fervent prayer Luther said, "Be of good cheer, Philip, you will not die," and from that moment Melanchthon began to revive and recover consciousness, and was afterward restored to health. This might be referred to as miraculous, and yet no one would find in the incident, more than at the most, a remarkable instance of an answer to the prayer of faith.

In like manner, the mention by Xavier of this only case that could possibly be construed as miraculous, instead of furnishing any proof that he wrought miracles, is rather proof that it was the farthest thought possible from his mind; and is proof also that, had there been any case in which he had thought himself aided by extraordinary divine power, we should have found him, as a truthful man, giving it a place in his letters; at least in one to Loyola, where we find recorded this, the only seeming miracle.* In justice to Xavier, therefore, we must conclude that the thrusting of miraculous gifts upon him was posthumous, that the most important part of the evidence has been manufactured for priestly purposes, to bolster up a decaying faith, or to attrib-

* In another letter he says, "God was moved by faith, and restored to a great number of sick persons health both of body and soul."—Vol. I., p. 155.

ute to the greatest missionary saint on the Roman calendar the possession of supernatural gifts, and thus make him appear to be what his biographer calls him—"the modern Apostle of the East."

It might seem superfluous to offer any further evidence in the same line; but it may not be unprofitable to make a short excursus, glancing at the character of the miracles attributed to Francis Xavier.

I shall quote one miracle entire, as narrated by Xavier's biographer, who says that the Japanese converts gave their testimony that many sick persons were healed by the sign of the cross, or by holy water; very justly adding the statement that "the most conspicuous prodigy of this time was, in general, the holy mortified lives of the ambassadors of Christ." Before quoting this miracle I may remark that, it is not improbable that some of the simple-minded of the Japanese, who heard Xavier narrate the miracles of Christ, confounded Xavier the narrator of them with Christ the author of them. Tradition made sad havoc with plain facts, and the commonest natural occurrences were construed into miracles, or invested with a semi-miraculous halo, which it is not in the nature of either time or Rome to dissipate.

I quote the following miracle from Xavier's biography, calling attention to the fact that it is not narrated in Francis Xavier's own words, and is not found in any one of his letters, or even remotely referred to, for which fact his biographer seems to apologize:

"Francis Xavier does not tell us himself of other incidents which attended his preaching, which have come to us on the testimony of eye-witnesses. No reader of his life will be surprised to find that now again his apostolate was illustrated by miracles. The most famous of these could not have been the first, for it was wrought in favor of the only daughter of a noblelman whom, in his agony of bereavement after her death, the new converts urged to recommend his case to the God of the Christians, and to have recourse to the prayers of the great teacher of the Portuguese. The father went to Francis Xavier, and threw himself at his feet; but

sorrow choked his utterance, and he could say nothing. Francis retired for a few moments * * into the little oratory in which he said mass, and after a short, fervent, prayer, came back to the poor suppliant and told him to go, that his prayers were heard. He said nothing more, and the nobleman was grieved and hurt. In this frame of mind he went homewards, and was met, first by a servant, who told him that his daughter was alive, and then by the girl herself, who ran to him and threw herself on his neck. * * Both father and child were at once instructed and baptized."*

It is only necessary to read this account to see how it in all probability originated. It corresponds so closely throughout with the Bible account of the healing of the centurion's servant that it is impossible not to think it originated through that narrative, as probably given to the Japanese by Xavier himself, with no thought of the use it should be put to, through mutilation and misconstruction after his death.

Another miracle is given bearing a striking likeness to one of the New Testament miracles. Xavier is said to have been walking by the sea-shore, where some fishermen were dragging their nets, but with no success. They had toiled long and taken nothing, when Francis blessed their nets with the sign of the cross, and bade them cast into the sea again. This time the nets were found full to abundance, and that part of the sea remained afterwards remarkably productive.

Another time a village was delivered from pestilence by the prayers of Xavier. Another time a deformed child was healed; again a blind man was restored to sight; again a leper was healed. At still another time, "a Japanese had been insulting and jeering at Francis, who turned to him and said gently, 'God preserve your mouth, friend!' The man was struck at once with a horrible and noisome cancerous disease in his mouth."

To these miracles might be added the most marvelous story of the small boat, lost for days at sea, and finally recovered through the prayers of Xavier. This story rests solely on

---

*Coleridge, Vol. II., pp. 284, 285.

the testimony of Mendez Pinto, whom even the credulous biographer of Xavier hesitates to believe. The internal character of the narration shows it to be a mere traveler's tale, put in that form because the writer of it was a chronicler friendly to Xavier, and to Rome.

But it is not necessary to follow the subject further. We have gone into it thus minutely to show that in rejecting the miracles of Rome, we have good reason for so doing, in the cases that seem most probable, and are best attested. A further result of our study may be to show us by contrast the superior kind of evidence we possess in favor of the New Testament miracles, whether we consider the internal character of the miracles themselves, or the external character of the testimony in regard to them. And, further, we may learn something of the subterfuges to which a decaying faith may resort, to keep itself alive in ancient haunts, or to win for itself a way in new fields. And further, and especially, we may have done something to rescue the name and fame of Xavier from the suspicions cast upon him by the Church of Rome. For it is manifest that much injury is done to the memory of Xavier by linking his work with the suspicious claim which he living never made—the claim that he was endowed with apostolic gifts, by virtue of which he wrought miracles of healing similar to those recorded in the first days of Christianity. Such a claim could not long be maintained without doing discredit to the actual labors of Xavier, and at the same time throwing the shadow of that discredit back upon the record of the earlier miracles. For if those early miracles are to be disturbed in their pre-eminence, they will ultimately be overthrown by doubt.

Lecky in his thoughtful, though not impartial book, on the *Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe*, very pertinently asks:

"What proof of the falsehood of Catholicism could be more decisive than that it was unable to establish any of the immense mass of miracles which it had asserted, that all these were resolved and dissipated before a searching criticism, that saints had been canonized, forms of worship established,

countless bulls and pastorals issued, innumerable rejoicings, pageantries, processions, and pilgrimages authoritatively instituted, public opinion all through Christendom violently and continuously agitated on account of alleged events which had either no existence, or which were altogether misunderstood ?"*

This, then, is our conclusion, that while the Protestant estimate of Xavier has commonly been unfair in denying him even his due; the Papist estimate of him has been even more unjust in attributing to him the power of working miracles, and the gift of tongues. The true judgment would probably be reached by striking an average between these two estimates. That Xavier might be called a Saint, even in the apostolic sense, we do not question; but that he should have been canonized because of the supposed possession of supernatural gifts, was a perversion of facts to which the honest Xavier would not have lent himself. For there is not in the whole life of the man one act or fact savoring of pious fraud; but those who came after him, less scrupulous than he, have built up upon the merest substratum of fact a superstructure of falsehood, which is all the more deceptive because not wholly fictitious.

Writing from the Capitol of the Empire of Japan, I am able to trace but faintly any influence left by this first of all the Christian missionaries to these shores. A few words, such as Crucifix, Maria, Santa, and Padre, have been retained in the language during all these intervening years. The sign of the cross, and the chief of the Christian festivals, have been faintly remembered. When this is told, all is known that Rome with hundreds of missionaries and thousands of converts succeeded in doing for the Japan of this day: not forgetting to place to the other side of the score that residuum of hate, of which we have already spoken, that undercurrent of disfavor with respect to Rome, and through her with re-

* Lecky's Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe, Vol. I., pp. 163, 164. Compare also p. 143, et seq.

spect to Christianity in general, which has a place in the minds of the majority of intelligent Japanese. There can be no doubt that the feeling in regard to "Vaticanism," represented in England by Mr. Gladstone, and in Germany by Prince Bismarck, is to-day strong and wide-spread in these distant islands of the sea.

ARTICLE IV.

GUARANTEES TO FAITH.

By Prof. S. A. Repass, D. D., Salem, Va.

Unless we are greatly mistaken, ours is an age characterized by unusual anti-christian activity. Certainly in no period in the history of Christianity in this land, have the principles of positive unbelief been disseminated with greater diligence. These have found place in not a few of our most respectable Reviews, home and foreign, and are thence copied into many of our most widely circulated secular papers and more popular magazines. Not a few of the pulpits of the land, tired of dealing with the old and positive teachings of the Bible, have become infected with the same spirit of unbelief, and give a sound as startling as it is discordant with all proper faith in the authority of Revelation. These latter may not directly attack the truths of holy scripture with the weapons of science. They would appear too consistent to prostitute thus openly their vocation. They are however none the less in sympathy with the skepticism of the age; only they manifest this in another way. The spirit of unbelief is upon them, and they prophecy against eternal punishment, against Hell and Damnation, with a boldness and persistency that are truly astonishing. And all this through a professed love of truth.

These attacks are none the less bold than those directed against Christianity by modern science. The latter, however, aims directly and confessedly at the very foundations of the Christian system. The "scientific method" demands that

Revelation shall be subjected to the severest critical tests—that nothing shall be accepted as truth upon the testimony of former ages. It virtually denies all belief in the agency of the Supernatural; or if the existence of this be admitted, it is as a mere abstraction, and has no practical claims whatever upon our faith. Belief in the miracles of a former age is accounted for upon the principle of "prepossession" in those who recorded them. That the evangelists and disciples of Christ belived that these things were really done is not for a moment denied. They were not however competent witnessess; for men have often been deceived, no less by the sense of sight than by the undue excitement of their mental states. Human testimony has been so far analyzed as to lead to the discovery of its subjective element, and this has been declared wholly unreliable. The miracles of the Bible are compared with those of the Church of Rome; and the revelations made to "holy men of old," through dreams and visions, with the phenomena of Mesmerism and Spiritualism. The grounds upon which we reject either are regarded as identical in principle. According to the "scientific method," the one class has been discovered to have been produced by mere trickery; the other, when the same method is rigorously applied, suffers the same exposure.

This opposition to a positive Revelation is waged from every quarter of the scientific world. There is no distinctive truth of the Bible which is not attacked. Even the existence of an infinite personal will, or of a personal Creator, is denied. Pantheism, Materialism, the manifold forms of Rationalism—all appear in much of our periodical literature. From every department of science and human knowledge come these anti-Christian principles. It requires only a slight knowledge of the history of error, in connection with that of human nature, to lead to this conclusion, that we are living in an age in which seeds are being sown that will ripen into a harvest rich in Infidelity.

It may be replied to all this, that these are really forms of errors long since exposed and refuted. The fact we readily admit; the conclusion, however, which may be drawn is exceedingly

faulty, viz: That the Church need not concern itself with these errors—that God will take care of his truth, &c. These persons forget that the world moves, and that error moves along and grows with it. Science is making wonderful advances in our day, and in all the departments of human knowledge there is unwonted activity. Infidelity is always first to occupy the advanced positions in the march of progress. Less conservative than those believing in Revelation, and without the restraints of positive truth or tradition wanting in the subjective elements of faith, these disciples of science push boldly forward in their investigations, and recklessly plant their anti-Christian standards upon the very outposts of human progress. Our fears are not from the errors themselves, nor from the forms they are assuming. They have a practical ground. How are they likely to affect the people? is the question which should give direction to our conduct. Will not these seeds fall into a soil most favorable to their germination and growth? We believe that the social, political and religious condition of the people are favorable to this movement against Christianity. The ground is in much part prepared, the enemy is diligent in sowing tares, and the harvest will be certain to mature in due time. It is of little practical interest that truth has prevailed in all former conflicts, especially if one should seek to justify indifference to these issues from that point of view. We know that unbelief has flourished elsewhere, and although subsequently overcome, it has been attended with the destruction of many. We know also that the battle between Christianity and Infidelity has never been fought in our land, and knowing our enemy we cannot hope to escape an engagement. Wisdom demands the utmost vigilance on our part. The signs of the times clearly indicate the fact no less than the severity of the coming conflict. To ignore these issues, or to fail in preparing to meet them, is grossly culpable because treachery to the truth.

Under these circumstances, what is the duty of those who are more especially charged with the defence of Christian truth? How can they best *guarantee* the faith delivered

through revelation made to prophets and apostles? Certainly not by ignoring the issues now being made. To despise an enemy is to give him advantage. Here, too, the price of liberty and safety is vigilance.

It will be sufficient in this article to note, under two heads, those *guarantees to faith* most vital in this, and indeed in every controversy of a similar character. Not that we would separate them, for only when united do they form a true defence against error. Neither are these urged as proper to be employed in instruction from our pulpits. The burden of all preaching should be now, as in the times of the holy apostle, "Christ and him crucified." But our ministry cannot afford to remain ignorant of anything that may aid them in maintaining the truth of Christianity. Very much must be learned which may not be directly used in the pulpit. He best preserves the faith who can best defend, as well as unfold and enforce it.

THE APOLOGIES OF CHRISTIANITY SHOULD BE THOROUGHLY STUDIED.

These may be gathered from history, from science, from a right anthropology, and, above all, directly from the word of God. These investigations may be carried into every department of truth, human and divine. Defences may and should be constructed over against every fortification real, or apparent, erected or occupied, by the enemy. Let the war be offensive and defensive, and carried against the very citadels of unbelief. *The Natural Sciences*, thoroughly and critically studied, testify with unmistakable unanimity to revealed truth. Christianity has suffered much through the indiscreet zeal of many of her defenders. God's works in Nature have been set over against his works in Revelation, thereby opposing him to himself. Ignorant of the harmony prevailing throughout the works of God, or frightened by the mere semblance of opposition, these have thought to preserve the one by attacking the other, inflicting in this way as much real injury upon the Church as the most undisguised enemies. Christian Philosophy has no more to discover a starting point for its investigations than Christian Theology. To the for-

mer no less than to the latter the δος που στω is given, and from this, one need fear no real conflict can ensue upon the most thorough research. *History* furnishes ample stores for Christian Apologetics. A denial of the truth of Revelation is tantamount to a denial of the unity of history, no less than to the significance of the changes and progress of nations. To deny the Teleology of History is at once to surrender all claims to philosophical thinking. Only when viewed in connection with the holy purposes of God, as revealed in his Word, does it possess any significance, or teaceh any lessons of true wisdom. *Man*, the noblest work of God, is the highest revelation in nature of the gracious purposes of his Creator. His wonderful endowments, his lordship over all beneath him, the very discord now existing in his being, point to Holy Scripture for their origin and solution. He is either what the word of God declares him to be, or he continues to be the Sphinx, the human head with the body of an animal. A true anthropology is certainly necessary to a clear intellectual apprehension of the Scriptures. Our nature properly understood furnishes a powerful vindication of revealed truth. *The testimony of the Bible* to its own truthfulness is most convincing. It is consistent throughout, and that not only with itself, but with all truth. The evidences furnished by it, although in themselves superior to all others, derive singular confirmation when studied in connection with the other works of God indicated. He, who rises to a true conception of the higher unity existing amongst all these, is entrenched in the strongest defences possible outside of an enlightened Christian experience.

This is no more that an indication, and a very imperfect one, of a few of the sources whence may be drawn arguments in defence of Christianity. There is no department of knowledge within the reach of human investigation which is not in harmony with the truths of our holy religion. A system of apologetics may be constructed of materials collected from every point in the natural and spiritual universe, consistent throughout with itself, and in entire harmony with evangelical truth. Such a work has never been accomplished. The

distinguished Pascal entered upon the undertaking, and had his life been spared, he would have added largely to his reputation by whatever additional progress he might have made with the work. Even in the faint outlines of the work left on record, we are filled with wonder no less at the vastness of the plan itself, than with his clear conceptions of the subject.

But however complete in itself, no system of apologetics can furnish absolute security against critical unbelief. Connected with this there is another factor even more important, yea, essential, to the perfection of our defence. This we may express in the following proposition:

THE SUREST GUARANTEE TO FAITH IS FAITH ITSELF.

This is not a truism, much less an unmeaning proposition. The objective faith has its surest, its only impregnable defence in faith considered as an evangelical principle, firmly rooted in the heart, viewed as the centre of the human personality. There is, and indeed there can be, no position gained or taken on the *formal principle* which is not open to more or less successful attack from unbelief. The reason of this is found in the very nature of revealed truth. This has its origin and its special end in the domain of spirit. Spirit must cognize and receive it; otherwise its proper power is lost.

The truth of the proposition above laid down is attested by the history of Christianity manifested in the Church. It is verified in manifold instances from the earliest period of Christianity to the present time. Whenever and wherever the truths of Scripture were made to rest upon a purely objective basis of proof, openings have been made in the citadel and the enemy has found entrance. When the true life of Christianity was lost, or the Church rested her defence upon the objective word or evidence alone, instead of evangelical faith in that word—upon miracles and prophecy, and canon and tradition, rather than upon the *material principle*, as relatively independent of these, (see Luther's work on the "Freedom of the Christian Man"), she has found herself, if not defenceless, in imminent peril.

This was the condition of the Church in England at the

rise of Deism in the eighteenth century. The doctrine of justification by faith was virtually lost, or held only as a dogma. Faith as the fundamental principle of all Christian life—as the very law of the new creation—had given way to the barest objectivism. Christianity itself was viewed rather as an improved code of ethics, and the Church regarded as an organization bound together by sundry excellent rules and principles of government, based upon evidences drawn from certain supernatural manifestations, such as miracles and prophecy, together with traditions reaching out from the early Church and continuing in an unbroken chain down to the present. Deism attacked this structure of ecclesiasticism with arguments drawn from metaphysics and natural philosophy, and the result was, that very many being without the true and only sure foundation were driven into unbelief. During this conflict the English Church built up the grandest systems apologetics ever constructed by human thought. But these were in general characterized by the spirit of the age, viz., pure Objecitvism. They did not venture beyond the *formal principle* of truth, or rather did not build their defences upon the only sure foundation, faith. The Church was loved and defended as an imposing relic of antiquity. Its true life had become buried amid a heap of choice ecclesiastical rubbish, too unwieldly to be used and too venerable to be removed. The movement begun by the Wesleys aimed at the restoration of the lost doctrine, or principle of justification as enunciated by Luther. The result of that movement has become a fact of history, and its success was mainly due to the presence of this vital factor. It may not be generally recognized that the Church of England to-day largely owes her evangelical life, so far as this exists, to the revival introduced through the agency of the Wesleys and Whitefield; nor that England is more indebted to them for her riddance from Deism than to the apologetical systems of learned divines. But a little impartial study of the history of those times and of the principles then introduced, will confirm the truth of the statement.

The history of the Church on the Continent was but a

repetition of the same conflict, or rather a continuation of it. Rationalism was only English Deism Germanized, and Orthodoxism, so far as concerned its methods of defence, was on the same principle as the apologies of English divines. The whole was a vast system of Objectivism, beautiful and complete when viewed at a distance, but vulnerable in its most vital parts.

The description of the English Church already given applies, as regards its condition, quite as well to that of Germany. For that the latter rested upon *pure* objective truth does not vitiate the argument we are making The Anglican Church did not suffer from these attacks, because she mingled much of error with truth, but because her systems of defence were incomplete and faulty in their very essence. Germany held the truth in its purity. Her Dogmatic systems constructed in the seventeenth century are wonders of their kind. All that human thought and the subtlest analysis could accomplish, were brought into requisition. This period was so nearly akin in form, and as we think in spirit likewise, to that remarkable intellectual movement of mediævalism, that it is most aptly characterized as the scholasticism of the seventeenth century. The guarantees of Christianity were sought in the external evidences. To these were brought the subtlest dialectics of these Protestant schoolmen. All was resolved into an Objectivism as perfect as human learning and logic could make it. That doctrine of a standing or a falling Church, justification by faith, was dogmatized, and thereby relegated to the *formal principle.* The subjective element in faith, in which is found its evangelical scriptural principle, was practically lost. This was Orthodoxism, not orthodoxy. Rationalism directed its attacks against this system of defence, or rather against this one-sided method of viewing truth. That it was largely successful is one of the best attested facts of the history of that period, and the result was mainly due to the character of the defences made by the Church.

Neither was Pietism, nor the diverse sickly forms of su-

pernaturalism, able to withstand the attacks of Rationalism. These were quite as guilty of a one-sidedness as Orthodoxism. In fact they possessed nothing of the consistency and muscular strength of the latter. We are not now concerned with the long and bitter controversy between the two, but only of these with the reigning unbelief. Many of the orthodox had not gone to the extremes of Orthodoxism; and many were classed with the Pietists, who were not guilty of holding the errors of Pietism.

The distinction is real, not fanciful. Orthodoxism is only another name for Objectivism, viz., that which holds the pure *form* of truth without possessing its life and power. That there were many answering to this description is a fact as easily determined as the relation between a tree and its fruits, or between cause and its effects. Pietism is the opposite extreme, and is characterized by bare subjectivity, viz., that which, undervaluing the importance of a pure faith, and the authority of objective truth, attempted to ground itself upon pious thoughts and feelings. As over against these, much more of true piety was found among the orthodox than among these pectoral Christians.

Against Rationalism these forms of Pietism were powerless. In the very nature of the case evangelical Religion can have no real existence, much less any sure defence apart from connection with Holy Scripture. The latter was attacked, and with it all those systems of false defence reared upon merely subjective states. Relying upon these, Pietism was soon forced to abandon many of the evidences thought to be impregnable. Unable to maintain the position taken, and without the knowledge of a safe line of retreat, it was driven to the necessity of surrendering to the enemy, and of entering into a conditional alliance with them. The ranks of Rationalism were largely filled with recruits from this source.

That a different result will follow in the controversy preparing in our land, there is no good ground to hope. Wherever the same principle of evidence is present and the antagonisms of unbelief exist, there the result will be repeated.

American pietism, of which there are many and sundry kinds, cannot escape the consequences we have indicated. It really possesses less consistency, and fewer elements of real strength, than its German parent. All the way from the gross errors of Thomas Münzer to the refined religious Pantheism of Schleiermacher, we find the representatives of this school. The inevitable tendencies of the errors held, or rather of the very principle of their religious life, are unknown to themselves. It will as little stand the crucible of the "Scientific method" as the phenomena of Mesmerism.

The conclusion reached is that stated in our second proposition: *The surest guarantee to the faith is faith itself.* The controversies indicated prove the truth of the proposition. But Christian faith can have no real existence except as it grows from and is founded upon the written word; and the security of that faith will be in proportion to the degree in which the saving truths of that word are clearly apprehended. Religious subjectivism, considered apart from the faith as its object, can afford no sure defence against unbelief. Neither can systems of truth, be they never so complete, guarantee that truth to those holding it, apart from evangelical faith vested in the personality. Justification by faith is the golden link which unites the formal and material principle of all revealed truth, and when this is wanting, or is not clearly apprehended in its relation to both, there can be no security against the antagonisms of error.

The reason is apparent. The strongest proof of the truth of Revelation is found in a true Christian experience; not that degenerate experience which grows from pietistic formalism, and feeds itself upon its own diseased subjective states, but that which *knows* because it has *believed* the record which God has given in his word. From this comes the true and the only true *certitude* of faith. Because Scripture has been given to reveal sin and salvation, he who realizes in an evangelical sense his sinfulness, and is saved from its condemnation and power through faith in Jesus Christ, is on a foundation which cannot be shaken by the most critical unbelief. He possesses that true Christian gnosis which is far above

the boasted gnosis of infidelity. To quote the language of a well known American author: "To him who knows from experience that he is a sinner, justly exposed to the wrath of a holy God, and who believes that Christ is his Saviour, who satisfies all his spiritual wants and aspirations, the objections of infidelity have as little weight as water upon a rock, or paper balls upon a fort." His faith does not merely rest upon the fact of miracles and prophecy, and theories of inspiration, or the doctrine concerning the Christ, but on Christ himself as therein revealed. Clad in this armor he can go forth to battle with the invincible confidence of David, knowing in whom he trusts, and assured of final victory over every enemy. This is to him a surer guarantee of the truth of Christianity, than the most thorough knowledge of the most perfect systems of Apologetics ever constructed.

The issues here presented do no violence to the word of God. Neither do they undervalue the authority of that word. On the contrary they preserve it in its true intent and nature. Truth was not given to be regarded as an end itself, but for our salvation. In order to this it must be believed. Without such hearty acceptance it cannot be truly known. He contends for what he does not possess who has not believed with the heart unto righteousness; he contends for a phantom whose faith rests on any other basis than the revealed truth of God.

The line of thought indicated in this article leads to directly practical conclusions. If we have not sounded a false alarm in regard to the positive advances of infidelity, it certainly concerns the defenders of Christianity, the ministry, to consider the best means of protection against the enemy. To remain ignorant of the weapons employed by the adversaries, is to be guilty of presumption, which, in the emergency, is little less than infidelity itself. And to trust in the strength of these outer defences alone, is to do battle without the presence or the order of the Captain of our salvation. In the union of the two is found our strength.

These issues involve responsibilities of the gravest character. Just in proportion as the pure faith of God's word is

corrupted or surrendered, is the foundation of salvation impaired. Whether it be by heresy or conscious unbelief, error is in its very nature destructive. To destroy the souls of men by teaching untruth, or to build insecurely and thereby invite these attacks of infidelity which may cause others to perish, is not less culpable than to destroy souls by a wicked example. The sphere of the pulpit is nearest the very citadel of truth. If that be true to its sacred relations, rightly dividing the word of God to those of whose souls we have charge, then will be an inner harmony which cannot be broken by the discords of infidelity. He alone stands in the strength of God, who stands in the exercise of conscious faith in the truth of his word. These guarantees are sure, because they conform to what is true in all the works and ways of God. To possess them is to possess the unfailing certitude of faith. He shall not be brought to confusion who is on this foundation.

ARTICLE V.

WHAT IS THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH TOWARD HER DELINQUENT MEMBERS?

Rev. A. W. Lilly, A. M., York, Pa.

Pastors and people have worried over this question. Measures have been devised and experiments made in the hope of reaching some results, that might serve as satisfactory solutions of the problem. It is necessarily a question of discipline, which adds to the difficulty of striking a line of action that will meet all cases. The exercise of discipline is not only a prerogative of the Church, but because of her responsible relation to her members, it is clearly her duty. Her great aim and effort are to be directed to the cultivation of holiness of heart and life among all her members. Amid the endless variety of nature and disposition in the membership, it requires constant watchfulness, earnest admonition, careful instruction, and judicious discipline, to bring all up to

their duty and keep them abreast in the ways and works of the Lord.

The Church is sometimes termed the "Assembly of the Saints;" often she is called "The Branch of God's planting;" and sometimes she is styled the "Fold of Christ." In any of these forms of expression in relation to the church, membership implies a personal and sacred alliance with Christ and a mutual relation to each other. But this last appellation is perhaps the most appropriate and expressive as related to this statement of the question. The Church is the "Fold" of which Christ is the chief Shepherd. Into it Christian believers are gathered for instruction and protection, and sympathy, and discipline, and for "growth in grace and in the knowledge of Jesus Christ." It is a body of Christian believers bound together in the strongest bonds of faith and love, and associated with each other in the most intimate communion; each one forming a part of the whole and a part of each other; and altogether forming a spiritual alliance for mutual strength and influence, and defence and encouragement.

OBLIGATIONS ASSUMED IN CHURCH MEMBERSHIP.

The terms upon which applicants are received into the Church are both definite and obligatory. Every form of admission in evangelical churches imposes compliance with the rules and duties of consistent Christian life, and is coupled with the promise, either expressed or implied, of being obedient subjects of divine grace. In the Lutheran Church applicants for membership are required to give to the church council "satisfactory evidence of repentance of sins and true faith in the Lord Jesus Christ." Also in the rite of confirmation, when the solemn act of consecration to God and his service is publicly consummated, the sacred vow is made "to live according to the doctrines and precepts of Christ and adorn them by a holy walk and conversation until death." Substantially the same obligations are assumed by those who unite with a congregation by certificates of membership from other congregations.

In this assumption of the vows of the Christian religion there is no reservation. It implies the surrender of the heart to Christ, and the joining of hands with the brotherhood of believers in good faith. It is not a mere form or custom that meets the demands of the age and gratifies the desire of friends, but a sacred covenant with Christ. It is a pledge of fidelity to the requirements of the Gospel, which admits of of no wide latitude of living, and no subordination of God's word to the whims and notions of men. But it is the voluntary "putting on of Christ;" the profession of "walking in the Light;" the public avowal of being "not conformed to this world but transformed by the renewing of the mind." It is the obligation of following the Saviour's first and great command 'to love God with all the heart and with all the soul and with all the mind and with all the strength, and to love his neighbor as himself.'

SPHERE OF CHURCH LIFE.

The Christian Church, in her nature and appointments, is a reforming and evangelizing power in the earth. Her history is brilliant with the statements of her triumphs, and the prophecies of her future conquests impart inspiration to the courage and faith of her people. What the Church is designed to accomplish in her organized and collective capacity, her members individually are to accomplish. Her grand and wide-reaching victories lie in the energy and fidelity and Christ-like spirit of her members. They are the "light of the world." They are the "spiritual cities set on the hill-tops of Christendom;" and their good works are to be seen of men and lead them to glorify God.

A community should always be better because of the presence of a Christian congregation. Christian people imbued with the spirit of the Master should stand out in a community as a mighty influence for good, and a strong, united and determined force against every form of vice and immorality. They should elevate the standard of morals and education and culture, and abound in faith and good works. And when the members of a congregation are consistent and uni-

ted in the spirit of love and vital godliness and activity, these results never fail. To this evangelizing influence every member is a contributor; it is the burden of his profession and the proper sphere of his church life. There is without doubt, a conviction on the mind of a member received into the Church, that he is "coming after Christ," and needs to bear his cross daily. The impression is deep and abiding that wilful sin must be abandoned, evil associations abhorred, holiness of heart and life practiced, and God's vineyard cultivated. Not one, or a few, but all, are alike to fill their sphere in the Church of Christ. Membership there is not a mere union for defense and self-satisfaction, but a union for aggressive work and for glorious achievements for Christ: not for ease and ornament but for cross-bearing and self-denials and for the conversion of souls. But what failures! what delinquencies!

PREVAILING DELINQUENCIES.

If all who name the name of Jesus were consistent and constant in "His doctrines and precepts," what a power the Church would be! For the most potent and irresistible influence in the earth is the union of the people of God joined in "one heart and one mind;" clothed in the beauty of holiness and endowed with the all-conquering power of faith. Then would the Church ascend to the excellence and majesty of Solomon's poetic picture, "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners."

But her beauty and efficiency are sadly marred by the multitude of her delinquents. Notwithstanding the solemn pledges of fidelity, and the consciousness of carrying heavy responsibilities because of this sacred relation to the Church of Christ, there exist a lamentable neglect of duty and a wilful disregard of personal obligations assumed in a profession of faith. And this delinquency is not peculiar to this age, or any other age of the Church. Ever since the days of Cain, the Church of God has been afflicted with delinquency and backsliding and apostacy. Joshua discovered a covetous Achan in the camp of Israel. The Prophet Elisha had in his

confidence and daily service the avaricious Gehazi. The Saviour Himself had in His school of Apostles the traitorous Judas. And the Apostles were confronted and had to treat with the falsehood of Ananias and Sapphira. Every shade of error and moral obliquity has abounded in the Church.

In our estimates there are grades in delinquency. Not unfrequently there are very liberal views held and expressed in regard to what constitutes delinquency in Christian life and duty. Custom and conventionalities are not unfrequently made the rule of interpreting Christian morals, rather than the word of God and the discipline of the Church founded on that Word. By delinquency, in this question, is meant *the failure of fulfilling the vows of a Christian profession, either by wilful neglect or wilful transgression.* Perfect obedience is not claimed, but a faithful and prayerful effort to live right, and a regular and conscientious use of the means of grace. Less than this cannot be accepted, because this much all are able to do.

Union with the Church is not an expression of personal holiness and moral beauty, with which to adorn her and lay her under obligation, but a public confession of personal weakness and spiritual necessities. Neither is it a spiritual partnership that may be continued or dissoved at pleasure, but a sincere and unreserved consecration of heart and mind and means to Christ and his kingdom for all time. According to our Formula of Government, members are required 'to lead a Christian life; perform all the duties required of them in the Scriptures. It is the duty of adult members to attend the public worship of God, partake of the Lord's Supper whenever opportunity affords. Parents shall educate their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; teach them the doctrines, and subject them to the ordinances of the Church.' A wilful neglect of these duties, and a wilful violation of God's word and Christian propriety, is clearly a delinquency.

Habitual and voluntary absence from the worship of God in the sanctuary is a failure of duty, and is unbecoming a

Christian. An indifferent feeling about attendance upon the devotional services of the congregation, is a sure symptom of declension. Absence from religious services—without providential hindrances—proves a distaste for the ordinances of religion, an evident unconcern about Christian example, a careless indifference about personal piety and church prosperity, and practical abandonment of fellowship with the people of God. Habitual neglect of the appointments of worship is an unmistakable sign of spiritual declension, and if not arrested will result in spiritual disaster.

Habitual neglect of the Lord's Supper is another form of delinquency that prevails in the Church. From all parts and branches of Zion come reports laden with regrets at the widespread delinquency in this part of Christian life. Multitudes have sworn allegiance to Christ, and have promised to "show his death until he comes," who seldom renew their covenant and reaffirm their discipleship at the Holy Supper. It is not now the question whether the observance of the Eucharist is essential to salvation, but it is a serious question of abiding loyalty to Christ. "Do this in remembrance of me" is an order of such emphasis and importance that no true and conscientious believer is at liberty to neglect it. Its observance is a binding obligation upon the disciples of Christ. It is the seal of the believer's covenant with his Saviour, and it is the public profession of his faithfulness until death. A wilful neglect of the sacrament of the altar is a virtual denial of Christ, and whosoever persists in this form of denial will probably be lost.

Another form of delinquency is personal inactivity. A decent moral life, a formal connection with the Church, and a reputable standing in the community, are deemed necessary; and many think that this is all that is required. There is a thoughtless presumption that the Church serves her members as a first-class coach, in which they have taken passage and are passively carried forward, in a style of ease and comfort and safety, to the portals of eternal life. The Church has multitudes on her roll "who have a form of godliness but deny the power thereof." They carry a showy profusion of

leaves but are destitute of fruit. "They have a name that they live, but are dead." They are unproductive, add nothing to the Christian character of the Church, and nothing to her working forces. They exert no positive influence for the advancement of the kingdom of God. They preach neither by precept nor example. They do not "visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction and keep themselves unspotted from the world." They take no part in the Sunday School, no interest in devotional exercises, and seem dead to all the vital interests of church life. What a cumbrous freight the Church is dragging along.

Another deplorable delinquency prevails among church members in the work of beneficence. The cause of God is languishing on account of the close and illiberal spirit that abounds among the professed friends of Christ. The benevolent operations of the Church are seriously embarrassed, and the progress of Christ's kingdom is retarded because of the meagreness of benevolent aid. People pray, "thy kingdom come," who do not feel the sacred obligation of helping it to come; whose souls have not been stirred deep enough to realize that praying without working is the sheerest hypocrisy. Amid the reign of financial depression, many men are disposed to bow the cause of God out of their attention on the plea of economy. They betake themselves vigorously to retrenchment as a Christian duty. They grow deeply conscientious about the matter of curtailing expenses, and begin by laying heavy reductions upon benevolent contributions. They may build houses—enlarge their possessions — adorn their homes, live on in extravagant dress and sumptuous fare, and make investments in stocks and deposits in safety banks, but retrenchment is imposed on their voluntary gifts to the cause of God.

Scripture nowhere prescribes how much a Christian man should give; this question is left to his conscience and his God. The Jewish Church was more definite in her requirements, and more binding in the performance of beneficent duty. The Christian Church intrusts this duty and grace more to conscience and the honor of her members. The Saviour

found the practice of giving among the Jews punctual and systematic, and he appoved its observance, and took occasion to point out and impress the beauty and grace of giving in his commendation of the poor widow's offering. She put in two mites—all her living. It was not the two mites he commended, but the largeness and sincerity of her benevolent soul. The apostle Paul commanded the Corinthians "Upon the first day of the week let *every one of you* lay by him in store as *God hath prospered him.*" Here we have the "divine rule of giving, as well as the duty and spirit of giving. But what amount of delinquents in the Church in reference to beneficence. Many excuse themselves to relieve their consciences. They presume to antagonize the various objects of benevolence; criticise the management of their operations, question the integrity of agents and judicious application of the benefactions. Some form other adroit and silly excuses, as the want of proper information, ignorance of the objects and necessities of benevolence. They read no church papers, and hear nothing from their pulpits—they live in sad and voluntary ignorance.

> "That man may last, but never lives,
> Who much receives but nothing gives,
> Whom none can love, whom none can thank,
> Creation's blot, creation's blank."

Beside these delinquencies which are more general, there are others of a graver character that affect the Church more seriously in the eyes of the world—the desecration of the Sabbath day in devoting its sacred hours to visiting or reading secular papers and improper literature: the indulgence in occasional profanity or intoxication: the yielding to temptations of dishonesty and immoral companionships: the patronizing of club-rooms and ball-rooms and social hops and dissipation; and the still more degrading abandonment to debauchery and lewdness and vulgar offences against society and God. These are reproaches of Christian character which admit of no apologies, and require the promptest and most judicious application of church attention and discipline.

These various forms of neglect of duty and transgression of Christian obligation are a reproach to the name and character of the Church, a failure of fulfilling the vows of religious profession, and endanger, the salvation of the delinquents.

WHAT RELATION DOES THE CHURCH BEAR TOWARD THESE DELINQUENTS?

The Church still holds a protective relation toward them. They hold a nominal connection, they are not dismissed from their allegiance, nor absolved from their accountability; but they are out of their proper and obedient relation, and have put themselves in an attitude which demands the prompt attentions of the Church. They have wandered from the right way and gone astray, and are exposed to imminent perils. And now the only reformative influence that will be extended, must come from the Church. The world has no saving power and no possible sympathy for a Christian delinquent. What relation does the shepherd sustain toward a straying sheep? It has strayed from the fold, and is in danger—it is lost, but still a sheep. If it is found and restored, it is worth as much as before. The duty of the shepherd is clear, "he leaves the ninety and nine, and seeks the lost until he find it." He perseveres, forgets fatigue, and distance, and discomfort, until the lost is found. There is no abatement in his anxiety nor effort until he succeeds. Then he shouts his joys and carries it home. He found his sheep and great is his triumph—he does not drive nor force it back, but in grateful tenderness restores it to the fold and rejoices in the trophy of his effort. The delinquent member has strayed away from duty and from usefulness, is lost to himself and to the Church, and out of obedient and worshipful relation. The mission of the Church is to save her members, to protect her charge, and rescue her imperiled wards. If possible her relation is more responsible for the care and safety of her members and rescuing them from danger, than to sweep the gospel net far and wide to gather the masses of the world. Success in reclaiming delinquents depends much on the spirit and manner of approaching them. Kindness and caution would direct the

shepherd's mission. So a Christian spirit could alone be successful in re-establishing Christian relation with a delinquent. No one would expect to reform broken alliances in a spirit of vengeance. Nothing can be affected in winning souls by frowns and scowls and fulminations of terrible retribution. It requires patience and forbearance, and perseverance, and the administration of tact and sympathy in the sympathy of Christ and in the love of a brother.

THE SPIRITUAL OVERSIGHT OF THE CHURCH DUE TO HER MEMBERS.

The duty of members to the Church, and their obligation to contribute to her honor and influence, are undisputed. But the vigilant care and prayerful oversight she owes to her members may sometimes be forgotten. The mission of the Church is to evangelize the world. Her heralds are sent out into the highways and by-ways to call the impenitent and bring them unto the ready banquet of the Gospel. The strongest language is employed to enforce her mission; "Compel them to come in;" "The Spirit and the Bride say come;" The people of God say "come," and influence their fellow-men to abandon their evil ways and bid them "Come with us and we will do you good." The apostle continues the call and exhorts men to "come out from among them and be ye separate saith the Lord." The Church opens her doors and calls in the penitent and believing. They come and are accepted. They are invited to her spiritual bounties and accept. They come in to enjoy the dispensations of the Gospel and the ordinances of worship. They come to find a school to learn, to find an armory from which to draw the necessary weapons of Christian warfare, to find a pleasant and attractive Christian home; to find a nursery for the weak and a hospital for the sick. The Church vouchsafes these spiritual comforts and sympathies and protection to those whom she receives into her communion. It is not too much to say then that the Church owes much to her members. She is expected to exercise a spiritual guardianship over all: encourage them to industry and fidelity in the service of the

Master; prevent delinquency if possible, and engage all members in some sphere of usefulness in the Church.

HOW MAY DELINQUENTS BE RECLAIMED?

There are members who will accept no service, take charge of no interest, and contribute nothing to church work. Some will grow inconsistent and discontented and require the constant application of reproof and encouragement and untiring watchfulness. Even then some will lapse into gross delinquency. First of all, the clear and ringing admonitions of the Gospel are required from the pulpit. All remedial influences lie in the light of the Gospel. They are authoritative and solemn and convincing and cannot be gainsaid. From the pulpit must go out the utterances of God's law and man's duty without the fear or favor of man. Let no man become a delinquent through ignorance of his duty.

Secondly, the utterances of the pulpit are not adequate. The thunder of its artillery is an empty sound to the absent delinquent. The preacher in the pulpit is the expounder of truth and duty, but the attentions and tactics of the pastor are essential in dealing with delinquent members. The preacher must be a shepherd as well. The religious training of a congregation is incumbent upon the pastor, as well as preacher, and especially in the work of following up and restoring the delinquent. The pastor knows best how to estimate the value of the soul. He knows best the nature of broken vows; understands best the delinquent's great peril and can better fathom the depth of woe that yawns beneath his wayward feet. His duty is to go out after the delinquent with diligence and perseverance, and find no rest until the lost is found. There hangs an untold burden of responsibility upon the pastor in reference to his proper treatment of delinquent members.

Thirdly, Pastors are not generally unmindful of their duties and responsibilities in regard to this question. They appreciate the value of a consistent and active member of the Church, and also the loss of a member. No effort nor pains are spared by them to restore the erring to their proper place

in the Church. Pastors need the strong and steady support and practical sympathy of the Church Council. The officers of the Church are essentially partners with the pastor in administering the affairs of the Church. Officers are not simply to superintend the temporalities of the Church, but they are to be "ensamples to the flock" of holy living, and spiritual guides in the ways of duty. Members are received into the Church and enfranchised with her privileges and rights, by the action of the Church Council. This official action is more than a mere technical permission to become members of the congregation—it imposes upon spiritual guardianship. They adjudge applicants worthy of communion privileges and of Christian fellowship, and thereby virtually assume towards them the relation of Christian guardianship. The duty binding on Church officers towards members is to encourage them in the right way, to influence them to activity and fidelity, and with the pastor to throw over them the shield of protection from evil, and follow the delinquents step by step with all the winning appliances of kindness and persevering effort to secure their return.

Fourthly, In addition to persuasive influences of the pulpit and the pastor and the Church council, there is a potent influence in the membership of the Church that requires to be exerted. The brotherhood of believers is a sacred and holy union which cannot be broken without causing anxiety and pain. Like members of a family the joys of one reach the hearts of all, and the sorrows of one touch the hearts of all. When one is in distress the house is sad. When one is unfortunate or strays away, there is a thrill of feeling deep and abiding in the soul of all the rest. They will all hasten to the rescue and persevere until successful or until the last ray of hope expires. The strong and sacred ties, that bind members of a Christian congregation in one, should prompt the same deep and abiding anxiety in the heart of all when one goes astray. The inconsistency and unworthiness of one member of a Church should awaken the deepest feelings of concern in all the rest, and rouse up all in the effort to reform and restore for the sake of the delinquent and for the sake

of the Church. If the first steps are watched, the earliest symptoms of declension treated, the majority of delinquents might be spared. Members have opportunities of knowing the tendencies and habits of their associates which neither the pastor nor Church Council can know. And to feel it a duty to correct the indications of remissness might save a soul from danger: and the magnetism and winning force of personal sympathy and kind approaches should prompt all church members to seek and find and save the delinquent.

True it is that there are many incorrigible delinquents, who seem beyond the reach of any influence for good. It is sad how many defy all efforts, and it is equally sad how many Churches never put forth any effort to reclaim the erring. Members drop out of the ranks of daily work—out of the communicant roll, and away from all church attendance, for whom no inquiry is made, and no one cares except the overburdened pastor. Equally true it is that the great majority of delinquents have become so by being neglected or unrecognized by their fellow-members. The unchristian and unreasonable clanishness in congregations has driven many an humble and faithful member away from fellowship and interest in the church. This wrong lies at the door of the church, and calls for the speedy return to Christian sympathy and cordial Church love. The genius and spirit of the Christian Church above all things require the reign of love and personal interest and cordial sympathy in the hearts of members for each other. And this is the potent influence that God will sanctify to the preservation of union of heart and life among the congregations.

To be successful in reclaiming delinquents the members of a church are bound to exercise in these spiritual methods of influence. And the Church must do it. The world will not. No reforming influences come thence. The Church must win the absentees back to their places: the neglecter of the Lord's Supper to its observance—the cold and careless to activity—the worldly-minded and illiberal to the practice of giving: and the outward offenders to repentance and reformation. This is the work of the Church, not of the world.

Erring and undutiful members are not ignorant of the fact of their delinquencies, and from their personal experience and sense of accountability should be easily won back. They must be made to feel the binding nature of their covenant with Christ. They must be made to see the magnitude of the injury they inflict upon the Church, and the aid and comfort they give the enemies of religion. They must see the exposure of their profession to the contempt of the world, and the imperiled condition of their salvation.

The New Testament abounds in counsels and admonitions in regard to delinquents. "If a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself lest thou also be tempted." Delinquent members are not to be left to themselves, but they are to be restored. They are not to be discarded and neglected or abandoned by the Church. If every one forsakes them the Church dare never be unmindful of her duty. In this state of error they are in extreme danger of being lost. And because of their errors and neglects all the sympathetic agencies of the Church should be called into requisition for their restoration. It is a crisis in their experience which affords her a special opportunity for the application of her remedial agencies.

Delinquents need encouragement. They are estranged from their duty and proper relation to Christ. They feel they are sinners and aliens, but they must remember that they have a great Saviour. Their manhood must be addressed and made to comprehend their possibilities through grace. They are not hopeless culprits, but wanderers from God and on the road to ruin. To them God says "as I live, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O! house of Israel."

Let the Church exercise a vigilant care over all her members and prevent any of them from delinquency, if possible: look faithfully after the neglecters of worship and the absentees from the Lord's Supper. Hold up constantly before the careless and inactive the claims of Christ upon their services

and press upon the illiberal that giving is a grace as well as prayer and worship. And, "Brethren if any of you," or any of your members, "do err from the truth and one convert him, let him know that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death and shall hide a multitude of sins."

The question of vigorous church discipline is involved and meets with different views. Church discipline is doubtless a necessity. The most active and prosperous congregations are found under the rule of careful discipline. As an educational measure judicious discipline is highly salutary—but as a penitential measure it is of doubtful expediency except in extreme cases, where the Church rather than the delinquent is to be considered. The safety of society demands the punishment of a criminal, so the safety and character of the Church sometimes demands the suspension or excommunication of an offender. But a hasty and ill-advised subjection to severe discipline is ineffectual and mischievous. Leniency and forbearance with the erring is more in accord with the spirit of the Master, who is graciously indulgent and patient with us, and is attended with greater probabilities of winning the offender to reformation and salvation.

The return of delinquents to their allegiance requires cautious but cordial attention. Give them the strongest proof of your confidence, and convince them of being cordially welcome. Give them full share of your sympathy and trust. Place into their hands such work as they are capable to manage. Interest begets interest and love begets love. Give them something to do. This is an important feature in church life. All need some responsible work. Appoint them on committees; associate them with active and faithful members, so that the affections of their souls strike deep root in abiding devotion to Christ and His cause.

ARTICLE VI.

ADAM.

* Translated from the German of Dean Buchrucker, of Munich, by Rev. G. F. Behringer, Indianapolis, Ind.

Adam (אָדָם, *Ἀδάμ*, Adamus, Adami, or Adam, Adae), equivalent to man, is the name of the first human being—a name given to him by God himself. * * * "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female created he them; and blessed them and called their name Adam," * * * Gen. 5 : 1, 2. But Adam's significance is not recognized, if he be considered merely as the foremost, similar being of the long line of his descendants, that is, simply as an individual. According to the Biblical account, he appears first of all as the end-object of the material world, in that its whole development was aimed at him. In progressive steps creation ascends unto him. At first the world is formed; after that, it is filled. The vegetable kingdom forms the conclusion of the first three days; man is the end of the whole creation. In it we find everywhere indications pointing to the coming of man, until he himself appears, the gathering together, as it were, of all these (Microcosm). As such he belongs, on the one hand, to this creature world as a constituent part: he is made dust of the earth (עָבַר אֲדָמָה). On the other hand, he must for this very reason rise far above the same. For whilst it is said of the other creatures: "And God said, Let the earth bring forth," we read of the creation of man that God in his behalf had conceived a special purpose, and that he created him "in his own image." What this is intended to convey cannot be gathered from an analysis of, or a distinction between צֶלֶם and דְּמוּת (image and likeness), but rather on

* From "Herzog's Real-Encyclopaedie," Vol. I., p. 138—40, 2nd Ed.

the one part, from the end appointed unto man (Gen. 1 : 26), and on the other part, from the manner in which he was quickened and inspired (Gen. 2 : 7). That end the Holy Scriptures declare to be his dominion over the earth ; and concerning the quickening we are informed, that it happened through God's breathing into him "the breath of life, and man became a living soul." But even if in the expression, "a living soul," the specific difference between man and animal be not given, yet it is contained in the statement that it was God who directly breathed it (the soul) into him. God is freedom, the absolute personality ; in the world reigns necessity. God's image is reflected in man in this, that man is a conscious Ego, a free personality, and moreover in a direct relation to God. Thus he is enabled to take possession of the earth and to keep it in harmonious unity with the Creator. In Adam, therefore, the being of man is presented to us in his God-appointed peculiarity : he is the unity of the Ego and of nature, in the intermediate position between God and the world. In this sense he is the end of creation, marked by creation's Sabbath.

We are still Ego and nature; but Adam was this in harmonious unity, as representative of mankind, as mankind in person. It is of the highest importance and significance that man should have been created as a personal unit, in contradistinction to the animal life of the species; for thus God and man are related to each other as person to person, the absolute and creative personality in personal relation with and over against man, which is the real foundation of the whole history of redemption. Therewith is necessarily understood that in Adam originally there existed no distinction of the sexes. He was not man (i. e. a male-being), much less man-woman (a hermaphrodite), but rather *the* man, as God designed him. And yet he did not become the representative of mankind in actual reality, until he became husband of the woman (who was taken out of him), the progenitor or head of our race. In what relation, however, he stands to the generations that have proceeded from him, according to the Biblical view, is first fully seen in the aim and object of the

history of redemption, in Christ, as the *second* Adam. * * "because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead," (2 Cor. 5 : 14).

The significant comparison between Adam and Christ is found in Rom. 5 : 12 seq., and 1 Cor. 15 : 21, 22; 45—49. In the first passage is developed the idea, how that through Adam, in consequence of his transgression, sin and death entered into the world; how this death from him passed over all men; and how this death reigns over all, without and before meriting the same through their own personal transgression. Yea, even more than this: condemnation (*τό κρίμα εἰσ το κατάκριμα*) likewise from Adam has passed over all men; which, conceived in its entire extent is consummated in death. Over against this reality, righteousness (*δικαιοσύνη* justification (*δικαίωσις*), and life, proceed from Christ, the second Adam, unto whose power the individuals are subject whilst on earth, without first being able to merit the same through personal service—but with the difference in the measure or extent of the resultant activity. Just as here (in Romans), sin and righteousness, death and life are compared, so in the passage in Corinthians, Death and Resurrection, in which the life secured to us in Christ is fully revealed. But, the many sinners condemned to death, as well as the many righteous children of life, are always considered under the personal unity of one representative head, through whose determining act their condition is decided. In what manner the personal freedom of the individual is thereunto related, is not here to be furthermore considered. For present consideration it suffices, that in and with Adam's transgression, the sin, guilt, and death of the human race were established; so that Adam was not merely the first man, but truly and really the representative head of the race.

Adam died 930 years of age, the father of sons and daughters (Gen. 5 : 3, 4).

Concerning the being of man as a free Ego, there has been no difference of opinion in theology. Pure Pantheism alone lowers the personality of man to a degree of self-consciousness, which must be overcome by him in order to be resolved

into the self-conscious universal.* Materialism regards man entirely as a product of nature, a subject of pure, natural necessity, even denying in him the existence of the soul. It knows of nothing but force and matter, notwithstanding that the marvel of self-consciousness can not be explained in this manner. But in this way the unity of the human race is annulled; for even if Vogt and Darwin derive everything from the primitive cell, they nevertheless assume the origin of the race from a number of primal pairs.

Theology firmly maintains the freedom of man. But as to the relation of Adam to the generations springing from him, different opinions were entertained at an early day. The earliest Greek Church Fathers do not express themselves upon the connection between the head of the race and his descendants. Irenaeus was the first who regarded the primal transgression as the joint act of the race. Origen, on the contrary, perceives in Adam's transgression no such determining act of the race. He regards man as sinful, because he determined himself for sin through an abuse of his freedom whilst in a certain pre-existent state. The bodies only of all who are descended from Adam are to be germinally conditioned in him.† The Church Fathers Gregory Nyssa, Gregory Nazianzen and Chrysostom, who otherwise occupy the same ground with Origin, trace sin back to the historical fall of Adam. But above all others Tertullian, Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrose, and Augustine, represent the Biblical standpoint. Ambrose most firmly characterizes the relation of Adam to the human race: "We have all sinned in the first man."‡ Pelagius, on the other hand, weakens this intimate relation. He beholds in Adam's sin merely a bad example to his descendants. Adam is but the first at the head of many; he regards him simply as an individual. Semi-Pelagianism (Cassian) occupies the same standpoint. It considers

---

*Vide Delitzsch, Apolog., p. 49.

†Origines: Contra Celsum IV., p. 534.—Kahnis: Dogmatik II.. p. 107. 108.

‡Omnes in primo homine peccavimus.—Apol. Dav.

the first transgression as the occasion and beginning of universal evil.

The Council of Aransio (Orange: 529 A. D.) returned to the Augustinian view. The Augustinian teaching, that mankind was latent in Adam, was generally entertained during the whole period of the Middle Ages. The Reformation period, likewise, which saw in the Semi-Pelagian system the root of all self-righteousness, returned to the teachings of Augustine on original sin, and reassigned to Adam the position which he occupies in the Scriptures. In Adam the whole race sinned; mankind was a fellow-subject with Adam in the first sin. "Adam is regarded as the common parent, source, and representative of the human race."* There Adam is everywhere the personality who carries within himself the species (race). The position of Rationalism, in its view of Adam, is characterized by the above remarks on Pelagianism: the standpoint of modern Speculative Philosophy, beginning with Fichte, by the comments upon Pantheism. Schleiermacher's opinion is indicated by the following passage: "We place in the stead of the relation of the first man to all his successors, the more general relation of each preceding to each succeeding generation, and say that everywhere the active sin of the former is the causative original sin of the latter."† It remains yet to be stated that Theosophy, since the time of Scotus Erigena, regards the primitive man as living originally in a glorified body.

---

*Adamus ut communis parens, stirps et repraesentator generis humani spectatur."—Hollaz. Vide Kahnis: Dogmatik III., p. 302.

†Glaubenslehre II., p. 66.

ARTICLE VII.

THE SCRIBES BEFORE AND IN THE TIME OF CHRIST.

By the Rev. B. Pick, Ph. D., Rochester, N. Y.

The literary activity of the men, so often mentioned in the Gospels, comprises the time from 458 B. C. to 70 A. D., *i. e.* from the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity to the destruction of Jerusalem.

A. THE SOPHERIM. 458 B. C.—200 B. C.

After the return, Ezra attempted to restore the Jewish polity to its former state, but he found his countrymen much neglected and ignorant. It was therefore his first care, to collect the different books of the O. T., to clear them of any error which might have crept into the text, and to cause them to be read and expounded to the people. In order to carry out these needful measures, he associated with himself a body of one hundred and twenty men, learned in the law (מבינים), the "*Sopherim* or *Scribes*," and which body is known in history as that of "the men of the Great Synagogue." Under the administration of the "Sopherim," the traditions increased in number and authority (*παράδοσεις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*, Matt. 15 : 2; Mark 7 : 3; *πατρικαὶ παραδόσεις*, Gal. 1 : 14), hence numerous purely ceremonial ordinances could afterwards be traced to this period. A few of them are ascribed to Ezra himself (Baba Kama 82*a*), although their character scarcely bears out these pretensions. A more important part of the functions of the Great Synagogue was that which concerned the arrangement, division, and interpretation of the sacred text. We are told that the Sopherim arranged the Old Testament into three classes, the *Torah*, *Nebiyim* and *Kethubim* (תּוֹרָה, נְבִיאִים, כְּתוּבִים),* according

* To the Torah, or law, belonged the Pentateuch; to the Nebiyim,

as certain portions were to be publicly read and interpreted, or only to be read, or in some cases to be wholly omitted in public reading. The duties connected with this reading and exposition of the Scriptures naturally devolved upon the more learned, who appear to have been regularly set apart for this purpose, and on stated days to have lectured in the various synagogues. "As the reader had mostly to translate the original text into the dialect of the people, to which they probably often added a brief exposition, the religious education of the people was almost entirely committed to them. The influence which they thus gained, the fact that from the paucity of books and the general ignorance, the people depended *entirely* on this religious aristocracy, together with the growing tendencies of the age in that direction, contributed not a little to place religious eminence in mere knowledge and outward observances, without spiritual experience or love. It also laid the foundation of the exaggerated notions which both teachers and taught afterwards formed of the dignity of the Rabbi or teacher"*

---

or Prophets, were reckoned the former prophets נְבִיאִים רִאשׁוֹנִים viz. Joshua, Judges, the books of Samuel, and of the Kings, and the latter prophets נ אַחֲרוֹנִים viz. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the minor prophets; and to the Kethubim, or Hagiographa, belonged all the rest of the Holy Scriptures, including also Daniel. That this order of the canon was the same in the time of Christ, can be seen from the fact, that in Luke 24 : 44, He speaks of *ὁ νόμος Μωσέως, οἱ προφῆται καὶ οἱ ψαλμοὶ.* From the fact of our Lord speaking of the Psalms as the third division of the O. T., it would appear that the book of Psalms stood first on the list of THAT DIVISION,—thus gave its name to all the remaining books, or Hagiographa, as this section of the sacred writings has been called. As the Psalms stood FIRST on the list of the third division of the O. T., so the book of Chronicles appears to have stood LAST among the Hagiographa; that this book closed this divsion, and hence the entire O. T., is evident from our Saviour's words, in which he sums up the bloodshedding of martyr-prophets from the foundation of the world, to the last martyrdom recorded in the canonical books of the Jews, viz. "from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple," (Luke 41, 50, 51; Matt. 23 : 35; 2 Chron. 24 : 20).

* Edersheim, Hist. of the Jewish Nation, p. 114.

Ordinarily, the various congregations met on Sabbaths, on Mondays, and Thursdays; on the latter occasions for the adjudication of causes according to the law of Moses, as well as for the reading and interpretation of the Bible. These teachers have generally left behind them one or more theological commonplaces, which are chiefly valuable as indicating the bearing of their theology and the direction of their teaching. They were afterwards collected into one of the treatises of which the Mishna or "traditional law* is composed, and which bears the name of "Pirke Aboth," or sayings of the Fathers. One of the most celebrated of the "men of the Great Synagogue," was the high priest, *Simon the Just* (הַצַּדִּיק *ὁ δίκαιος ἐπικληθεὶς διά τε τὸ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβές καὶ τὸ πρὸς τοὺς ὁμοφύλους εὔνουν,* Jos. Antiq., xii., 2, 4), a man revered for his sanctity and true patriotism. As we are told in the Pirke Aboth, Simon was the last surviving member of the Great Synagogue (משירי כנסת הגדולה,) and lived probably between 300—200 B. C. His motto was: "The world subsists upon three things: upon the law, upon the ministry and upon acts of mercy."† That he was held in great honor, we see from the expression in the magnificent eulogy of Ben Sira, the writer of Ecclesiasticus, who in recounting the services which Simon had rendered to the temple and city of Jerusalem, proceeds in these admirable words: "How beauteous was he when coming forth from the temple, he appeared from within the veil. He shone in his days as the morning star in the midst of a cloud and as the moon at the full. And as the sun when it shineth, so did he shine in the temple of God. And as the rainbow giving light in the bright clouds, and as the flower of roses in the days of spring, and as the lilies that are on the brink of the water, and as the sweet smelling frankincense in the time of summer. As a bright fire, and frankincense burning in the fire. As a

---

* Comp. our Art. the TALMUD, in the *Baptist Quarterly*, 1876, p. 66, sq.

† This sentiment sufficiently indicates that Simon belonged to the Pharisaical party.

massy vessel of gold, adorned with every precious stone. As an olive tree budding forth, and a cypress tree rearing itself on high, when he put on the robe of glory, and was clothed with the perfection of power," (ch. 50 : 5—12).

B. EARLIER TANAIM. B. C. 200—70 A. D.

With Simon's successor a new era commenced, that of the Tanaim or Teachers of the Law.* The chief aim of these men was—1, to fix and formularize the views and expositions of their predecessors, the Sopherim, and to pass them as laws. Thus fixed and established, these views were termed *Halachoth* (הלכות)—law. They are composed in Hebrew and expressed in laconic and often enigmatical formulae. The formularizing of these *Halachoth* was especially needed, since the successive ascendancy of the Persians, Egyptians, Syrians and Romans over Palestine, greatly influenced the habits and conduct of the Jewish people, and since the Sopherim themselves, did not set forth their opinions as final. The relation which the work of the *Tanaim* or the *νομοδιδάσκαλοι* in this department bears to that of the Sopherim will be better understood by an example. The Sopherim deduced from the words "*when thou liest down and when thou risest up*" (ובקומך בשכבך, Deut. 6 : 7), that it is the duty of every Israelite to repeat both morning and evening the sections of the law (*i. e.* Deut. 6 : 4–9 ; 11 : 13–21), which proclaim the unity of God, without specifying the hours during which the passages are to be recited. Whilst the *νομοδιδάσκαλοι,* accepting this deduction of the Sopherim as law (הלכה), *fixed the time,* when this declaration about the unity of God is to be made

* The appellation TANAIM is Aramaic (תנאים, sing. תנאי, frequentative of the Chaldee תנה=Hebrew שנה, to REPEAT), and literally denotes REPEATERS OF THE LAW or TEACHERS OF THE LAW. In the N. Test. they are denominated *νομοδιδάσκαλοι* (Luke 5 : 17; Acts 5 : 34). In later times they are called RABBANAN (רבנן=our teacher, RABBANI (*Ῥαββουνι,* Mark 10 : 51 ; John 22 : 16), RABBON and RABBI=*ῥαββι* (Matth. 23 : 7).

by every Israelite, without mentioning the length of the section to be recited, or that it is a duty to do so, because they founded it upon the interpretation of the *Sopherim* (*Mishna Berachoth*, 1 : 1—5. 2. The Tanaim compiles exegetical rules (מדות), to show how these opinions of the Sopherim, as well as the expansion of these views by doctors of the law, are to be deduced from the Scriptures. 3. They developed the ritual and judicial questions hinted at in the Pentateuch in accordance with the requirements of the time and the ever-changing circumstances of the nation. As the period over which the work of these teachers of the law extended was very long, and as the older doctors of this period expressed their definitions of the *Halachoth* in extremely concise and sometimes in obscure formulæ, many of these *Halachoth*, like the Scriptures, needed further elucidation, and became the object of study and discussion among the *later Tanaim.* These discussions, as well as the different modes of exposition, whereby the sundry *Halachoth* were connected with the Bible, which reflect the mental characteristics and idiosyncrasies of the partiular teachers and schools, were gradually collected and rubricated, and now constitute the contents of the *Mishna* (cf. our Art. on the *Talmud*) and the commentaries on the Pentateuch entitled *Mechilta*,* *Siphra*,† and *Siphri*.‡

The first of these earlier Tanaim is *Antigonus of Socho* (about 200—170 B. C). He was a disciple of Simon and the first who bears a Greek name. "He probably belonged to the Grecian party, which by an imitation of Grecian practices,

---

*Mechilta מכילתא, the oldest commentary on Exodus, first published at Constantinople, 1515. A critical edition was published by J. H. Weiss, Vienna, 1860, but the latest ed. is that of M. Friedmann, ib., 1870. A Latin transl. is given in Ugolino's Thesaur. Antiq. Sacr., Vol. xiv.

† Siphra ספרא, a commentary on Leviticus, published with a commentary by M. L. Malbim, Bucharest, 1860. Another ed. is that by J. H. Weise, Vienna, 1862; transl. into Latin in Ugolino's Thesaurus, vol. xiv.

* Siphri ספרי on Numbers and Deuteronomy, latest ed. by M. Friedmann, Vienna, 1864; Latin transl. in Ugolino's Thesaurus, vol. xv.

sought to bring about an intimate union with those foreign masters of Palestine who were objects of pious abhorrence to the Pharisees. It is to this tendency that the sect of the Sadducees which traces its origin to the successors of Antigonus owes its origin. Unlike the Pharisees, the Sadducees were primarily a political and only secondarily a religious party. Their theology, which is rather negative than positive, was modified in accordance with their political aspirations." The motto of Antigonus, which fully accords with this view, was: "Be not like servants who serve their master for the sake of a reward, but imitate servants who serve their master without looking for a reward, and let the fear of Heaven be upon you." *

About this time the terrible persecutions of the Syrians, who sought to force Grecian culture and idolatry upon the Jews, led to the popular rising of the Maccabees. The independence of Israel was secured for a time, and the Maccabees ascended the Jewish throne as the *Asmonean* princes. During this time the activity of the men of the great Synagogue was necessarily interrupted, and when we meet again with a supreme Jewish council, it re-appears (about 172 B. C.) under the name of *Sanhedrim* under the auspices of the Asmoneans. During the time which intervened between Antigonus' death and the establishment of the Sanhedrim, Zadoc and Böothus, his diciples, probably directed the theology of their time. It is said that a perversion of the principles of their teacher Antigonus, led them to found the sect of the Sadducees. Thus the treatise *Aboth* of R'Nathan, ch. 5, states: "Antigonus had two disciples, named Zadoc and Böothus. These heard the words of their master, but understood them not; therefore they said 'shall a laborer work all day, and not receive his wages in the evening? Surely if there were any reward or future state after death, or if the dead were ever

* Aboth 1, 3. Pressensé in his "Jesus Christ : his Times, Life and work," (Am. ed. 1868 p. 68 sq.) calls this maxim a "noble and almost evangelical one, a most beautiful maxim, and one denoting a legitimate reaction from the legal formalism which was in process of development."

to rise again, our teacher would not have directed us to expect no reward.' Accordingly, they collected disciples and founded the sect of the Sadducees or Böothusees, whose doctrine was that the soul perisheth with the body, and that there is no resurrection of the dead, nor angels, nor spirits." It is impossible, however, to determine whether these Rabbins were really at the head of the Grecian party, which, as a religious sect bore the name of Sadducees; or whether at a later period, the sect in question had, from a desire to trace their principles to the earlier Tanaim claimed these Rabbins as the first propounders of their principles.

We have already stated that the men of the great Synagogue were succeeded by a Jewish tribunal known as the Sanhedrim (*συνέδριον*, סנהדרין). The somewhat indefinite accounts of their spiritual activity become more distinct as we approach the period of the Saviour's advent. The Sanhedrim was the supreme court, and decided as the last instance in all juridical and theological questions. It consisted of seventy-one members (Sanhed. 1: 6), with two clerks. The meeting-place was in the *Hall of Squares* (לשכת הגזית), until forty years before the destruction of the temple [i. e. while the Saviour was teaching in Palestine], the sessions were removed from the Hall of the Squares to the Halls of Purchase, (*Sabbath* 15 *a*, *Aboda Sara*, 8 *b*), on the east side of the temple mount. The members of the Sanhedrim were not professional men in the sense of devoting their whole time to their peculiar avocation, or deriving their livelihood from it. In fact, they were engaged at various trades on which they entirely depended for support, with the exception of a small compensation made from the temple-treasury for any loss of time. Their ordinary avocations appeared so much the less incongruous with their duties in the Sanhedrim, as in general every truly devoted or Pharisaical Jew, was, according to the current notions of the time, expected chiefly to devote himself to theological studies, and to follow his worldly calling only in order to support himself, or to minis-

ter to other students of the law. Hence, as the honor of being a member of the Sanhedrim was not reserved for the priestly order (although a consiberable portion of its members probably belonged to it), so the members of any trade, except those which were supposed to be degrading, or to have a tendency to harden, might aspire to this distinction. The members of the Sanhedrim were chosen for life, and regularly ordained by the imposition of hands סְמִיכָה (*Sanhedr.* 4:4). Every description of their arrangements and order of procedure necessarily dates from a later period, although it was probably substantially the same at all times. The members sat in a semi-circle (גורן עגולה כהצי) with the *Nasi* (נשיא=*prince*) or president in the middle, and the *Ab-beth-din* (אב בית דין) or vice-president at his right, and *Chacham* (חכם wise man, perhaps the head of the theological department) at his left. The other members occupied places according to their rank in the college, so that the fourth, the sixth, etc., in dignity, sat to the Nasi's right hand, and the fifth, seventh, etc., to his left. Twenty-three members were necessary to make a quorum. Opposite to the Judges, in twenty-three rows (each row containing twenty-three) sat the students, arranged according to their merit. Another body of hearers were ranged all around the hall. There were thus two orders, the members of which expected promotion. The hearers might be elevated to the rank of regular students, and the students might advance from row to row, and finally become members either of any of the provincial colleges, or of the Sanhedrim itself. Vacancies in the latter were filled up by the promotion of members of provincial colleges, or by that of distinguished students. In order to understand the position of the Sanhedrim, and its relation to other colleges, it is necessary to recall certain general principles.

The Jewish state was meant to be a theocracy, and the spiritual and secular administration in it were in reality not separated. The authorities of the synagogue were at the

same time the ministers of justice. Thus every considerable synagogue had its Sanhedrim, or College of Justice, consisting of twenty-three ordained members, who were entitled to pronounce sentence even in capital cases. The smaller synagogues, or those in towns with fewer than one hundred and twenty heads of families and ten synagogue officials, possessed an inferior College of Justice, which consisted of three members, who were only allowed to adjudicate on civil cases. From the College of three, an appeal might be taken to the nearest College of twenty-three, and from the latter to the lowest of the three Sanhedrims of twenty-three in Jerusalem, (said to have been in connection with as many synagogues in that city), and so on till the case reached the great Sanhedrim, which must be viewed as the College connected with the Temple. The priests seem to have had a College of their own, which decided on all matters purely relating to them, or the temple police.

If certain judicial duties devolved on the members of the various Colleges throughout the land, it was theirs also to provide for the spiritual instruction and edification of the people. Hence, on Sabbaths and feast-days, lectures were delivered in the synagogues, and at a later period in the various school houses also, at which all were invited to attend. Men and women sat separately, and listened respectfully to the lecture of the presiding rabbi, to the *chacham* (חכם, *i. e.*, wise man), or *darshan* (דרשן, *i. e.*, preacher), as he was designated. But in case the preacher should use language too abstruse, or fail to adapt himself to the weaker capacities of his hearers, an arrangement was made by which the preacher communicated his discourse in a low tone to an "interpreter" (the *meturgemam*), or "speaker" (*Emora*), who in turn rehearsed it to the audience in a plain and popular form.*

After these few explanatory remarks, we turn to the history of the Sanhedrim. The first president and vice-president of the Sanhedrim were *Joses ben Jœser* from Zereda, and

* Cf. Edersheim, l. c.

Joseph ben Jochanan from Jerusalem. They flourished from about 170—140 B. C. Little is known of their peculiar teaching. Their fundamental principles are somewhat vague, but point in the direction of increasing rabbinical influence and pretensions. The first said, "let thy house be a meeting place for the wise; dust thyself with the dust of their feet and eagerly drink in their words," (Pirke Aboth, 1 : 3). In the Maccabean struggles, Joses played an important part, and was one of the priests who were slain by Bacchides through the treachery of Alcimus, (1 Macc. 2 : 42; 7 : 12—16). The second said, "let thy house be wide open, and let the poor be the children of thy house. Do not multiply speech with a woman. If this applies to one's own wife, how much more to that of another man? Hence the sages say, that the man who multiplies speech with a woman bringeth evil upon himself, swerves from the words of the law, and will finally inherit destruction," (Aboth 1 : 5). Both were held in great esteem, and, at their decease, it was said, "those in whom every excellency was found, had now departed," (Sota 14 : 9).

To them succeeded *Jehoshua ben Perachia*, as president, and Nithai of Arbela as vice-president, from 140—110 B. C. Their administration fell in troublous times. The throne and priestly office were conjointly occupied by Jochanan ben Simon, ben Mattathias, commonly called John Hyrcanus (B. C. 135—106), who, justly or unjustly, was supposed by the Pharisees to have been derived from a mother who at one time had been a captive. In their view, this incapacitated him for being high-priest. Whether this was a pretence to hide their general opposition or not, their enmity soon manifested itself. The king having returned from a glorious victory, and being pleased with the condition of the people at home, gave a banquet, to which he invited both Pharisees and Sadducees. As he was enjoying himself in the midst of his guests, he, instigated by the Sadducees, asked the Pharisees to tell him whether there was any command which he had transgressed, that he might make amends, since it was his great desire to make the law of God his rule of life. To this one of the Pharisees replied: "Let Hyrcanus be satisfied

with the regal crown and give the priestly diadem to some more worthy of it, because before his birth his mother was taken captive from the Maccabean home, in a raid of the Syrians upon Modin, and it is illegal for the son of a captive to officiate as a priest, much more as a high-priest." The Sadducees, who had thus far succeeded, tried to persuade Hyrcanus that the Pharisees did this designedly, in order to lower him in the eyes of people. To ascertain it, Hyrcanus demanded of the Sanhedrim to sentence the offender to capital punishment. But the Pharasaic doctors of the law, who had no special enactment against indignities heaped upon a sovereign, who believed and taught that all men are alike in the sight of God, and whose very president at this time propounded the maxim of leniency,* said that according to the law they could only give him forty stripes save one, which was the regular punishment for slanderers. It was this which made Hyrcanus go over to the Sadducees, massacre many of the Scribes, and fill the Sanhedrim with Sadducees. (Comp. Joseph. Antiqq., xiii., 10 : 5, 6). In the persecution which now ensued, the leading Pharisees fell victims. The president of the Sanhedrim, Jehoshua, managed however to escape to Egypt. Hyrcanus was succeeded in the government by Judas Aristobulus, and, after the brief reign of that prince, by Alexander Jaunai. The latter also belonged to the Sadducees. This circumstance, together with the despotism of his reign, and the many sanguinary wars in which he engaged, rendered his administration more than ordinarily popular. The feeling of the masses displayed itself unmistakably, when, on the feast of tabernacles, while the king as high-priest was preparing to sacrifice, the worshipers threw at him the pomegranites, which at that feast they always carried in their hands. The king's subordinates commenced at once to quarrel with the Rabbis, because they had attempted to weaken the honor and authority of the king

* "Have a teacher procure an associate, and view the acts of others in as favorable a light as possible," (Aboth 1 : 6). His colleague's maxim was : "Keep aloof from a wicked neighbor, have no fellowship with sinners, and reject not the belief in retribution," (ibid. v. 7).

and of the high-priest. While this was going on, one of the disaffected rabbis approached the king rudely, crying as he came, "Woe to the, thou son of a profane woman! What art thou doing? How canst thou dare to meddle with the priesthood? Thy mother (meaning his grand-mother, mother of Hyrcanus), was a profane woman, and thou art not fit to be high-priest. Startled and alarmed at the assault, and perhaps expecting to be attacked murderously by those around, he shouted, "The sword! The sword upon the wise men!" (חרב חרב על חכמים). The order was obeyed with such fury, that six thousand of the people were slain on the spot, and the survivors dispersed and fled from Jerusalem. Only one rabbi, Simon ben Shetach, the brother-in-law of Alexander, escaped to Egypt, where he joined his former teacher Jehoshua ben Perachia.* Through the influence of his sis-

---

* By a strange anachronism some Jewish authorities declare the Ex-Nasi Jehoshua to have been the teacher of Jesus of Nazareth, pretending that he fled with him into Egypt, and which, as a modern Jewish writer of a life of Jesus says, "THE RABBI DID NOT NOTICE IN THE GREAT CONFUSION AND CONSTERNATION!!! The writer, to whom we have alluded, Mr. Isaac Goldstein, gives us in his JESUS OF NAZARETH, "an Authentic Ancient Tale," (New York, 1866), the following historical (sic!) description of what took place in Egypt between Jehoshua and Jesus. On p. 103 our admirable writer states: "Rabbi Jehoshua ben Perachia, with his disciples, left Alexandria for Jerusalem. On the road he stopped at a house kept by a woman noted for her kindness and her piety, and she paid every attention and mark of respect to the Rabbi and his followers, and when they took their departure, the Rabbi said, 'Beauty dwells in this house. God shall bless thee in all thy undertakings. Mayest thou be like a fruitful vine by the side of thy husband; thy husband shall praise thee, and thy sons shall grow up a pride and honor to thee. Whoever shall see thee shall say: 'Hail unto thee! hail unto thee!' When Jesus heard the blessing of his Rabbi, he laughed, and said, 'Rabbi, the woman has sore eyes, and is anything but neat in appearance, therefore she cannot possess beauty; and pray of what can she be proud? or for what can she be praised?' The Rabbi looked eagerly around, and seeing that it was Jesus who had spoken, said, 'Leave us; leave us at once, treacherous and ungodly man. Dost thou suppose that I spoke of bodily beauty? We wish thee not in our company. Depart and annoy us no more.' Jesus departed, but some time after returned, and

ter, the queen, Simon was soon recalled, and now exerted himself to remodel the Sanhedrim, which had in the interval re-assembled, but now consisted almost entirely of Sadducees, and ignorant persons, whose sole claim to distinction was their political support of the king. Simeon's plan for expelling these persons deserves mention, both for its success, and as in itself an important step in the development of Rabbinism. He first trained a number of students, and being thus prepared to substitute orthodox Rabbins for the old members of the Sanhedrim, he prevailed upon that body to resolve that in future every theological or juridical discussion should be supported by an appeal either to Scripture or to tradition. An occasion soon offered for putting this resolution in force. Whether by pre-arrangement or accidentally, the king and queen honored the Sanhedrim with their presence. As usual, questions were proposed and answered by the Sadducees in a sense contrary to the written and the oral law. Simon insisted on the requisite proofs. One of the senators promised, indeed, to bring them forward at the next

---

begged the Rabbi to re-admit him to his college, but the Rabbi sternly refused, and one day when he was engaged in prayer and the profession, Shema Israel (Hear, O Israel), he again appeared before him, and the Rabbi made signs to him to repent, but Jesus did not understand him; he thought, the Rabbi does not wish to accept me; I can see that I am an outcast, an unworthy candidate in his estimation, and it is evident they will receive me no more. And why should I yield to gloomy thoughts and fancies? It is time for me to carry out my designs openly. Their voices I shall not fear, and their multitude cannot overthrow me. I shall venture, let the consequences be what they may.'

With this resolve Jesus turned away, and erected an altar, stone on top of another stone, and at once commenced practicing his witchcraft; and many were induced to turn from the old law and believe in him.

When Rabbi Jehoshua heard this, he sent word to him, saying, 'Desist, repent, wash thyself in the waters of purity, return from thy evil ways. If I have in a moment of anger refused thee, I can again reconsider my resolve, and admit thee.' Jesus sent word back, saying: 'I have learned from thee this doctrine. Whoever sinneth and causeth others to sin, can never repent nor be forgiven.' "—*Sapienti sat!!!*

sederunt, but being unable to do so, he felt obliged to resign. His place was filled by one of Simeon's adherents. Only the old Nasi, *Judas ben Tabbai*, a man of good intentions, conscientious to scrupulosity, but weak and wholly under the guidance of Simeon, was retained. Simeon had now become vice-president.* They flourished from 110—65 B. C., but which of the two was the president, is a matter of dispute. The fact is that Ben Tabbai, though a well-meaning and virtuous man, proved himself to be incompetent to his office, and was induced to resign it. His motto was: "Be not like the orderers of judges (probably the procurators or governors). When parties are before thee, treat them as if they were innocent," (Aboth 1 : 8). As for Simeon Ben Shetach, whose maxim was: "Be extremely careful in examining witnesses, and beware lest from thy mode of questioning they should learn how to give false testimony" (ib., v. 9), he was a man of inflexible rigor, a high-minded ecclesiastic, sensitive withal, thought it no sin to refuse forgiveness to an adversary, and was ever on the alert to magnify his office. One anecdote remains to illustrate his character, and to show that he had given his royal brother-in-law great offence before the flight to Alexandria. In the Talmud (Sanhedrim trach. כהן גדול) we read the following: "One of the king's servants had committed a murder, and then absconded. The king, as master of the fugitive, was summoned to answer for his servant, and, as master did honor to the law by coming. As king, he remembered his dignity, and sat down in court, Ben Shetach being judge. "Stand up, king Jaunai!" shouted this haughty judge, "stand up upon thy feet, while they bear witness concerning thee. For thou dost not stand before us, but before Him, who spake, and the world was. * *

*His first step was to procure, through the queen, a pardon for his former teacher and friend, Joshua, who was still in Egypt. He communicated to him the intelligence of his liberation from exile in the following enigmatical epistle: "From one Jerusalem, the holy city, to thee, Alexandria, in Egypt. My husband lives in the midst of thee, and I mourn desolate and lonely." Joshua readily understood the purport of this message, and immediately returned to Jerusalem.

The divine displeasure was so signally manifested in consequence, that a law was enacted to this effect: "The king neither judges, nor is he judged," (ibid. 2 : 1). Of Simeon the Talmud also records, that on one occasion he sentenced and executed eighty women convicted of witchcraft. Two of the relatives of these women conspired together to obtain full revenge on the rigorous judge. They accused the only son of Simon of a capital crime; and so skillfully had they planned their charge and framed their evidence, that the innocent youth was convicted, and the wretched father compelled to pass sentence of death upon him. When the young man was led forth for execution, the false accusers relented, and came forward to declare that they had committed perjury, and that the convict was innocent. But the law forbade the re-opening of closed testimony, and though Simon's fatherly feelings for a moment made him hesitate about the propriety of the execution, yet his son, to uphold the dignity of the law, exclaimed to him, "Father, if thou wishest that salvation should come to Israel through thee, pay no regard to my life! and accordingly the son died a martyr to the honor of the law, (*Sanhedrim* 1 : 5 ; 7 : 3). No wonder that tradition celebrates Simon b. Shetach as "the restorer of the divine law to its pristine glory."

With the vicissitudes of those troubled times the Sanhedrim was subject to alternate changes, now omnipotent, and now depressed to the verge of ruin. Involved as was its existence with the politics of the day, it will be necessary to take a glance at the course of events which form the history of the Jews at that period. Hyrcanus had left five sons, of whom John Aristobulus succeeded, and was speedily followed by Alexander Jaunai. On his death his queen, Alexandra, was declared regent. She sided with the Pharisees, who thereupon regained their ascendancy. The late king had left two sons, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus. The former who had been named by his father as his successor, was now made high priest. The succession, however, was disputed by Aristobulus, who attained the pontificate and the throne. Hyrcanus making a vigorous effort to recover his rights, Aris-

tobulus entered into negotiations with Pompey, then concluding those victorious eastern campaigns, in which he had finally triumphed over the brave Mithridates. The Roman general taking advantage of some prevarications in the conduct of Aristobulus, poured his legions into Judea, and by the capture of Jerusalem, reduced the Jewish territory to a Roman province. The king made a fruitless attempt to emancipate the nation from this new thraldom, which resulted in a yet more complete subjugation of the province by Gabinius, who, in settling the affairs of the state, confirmed Hyrcanus in the high-priesthood, and removed the civil administration from the Sanhedrim, by investing it in five local courts, in as many districts, into which he divided the country, Jerusalem, Jericho, Gadara, Amathis, and Sephoris (Jos. *B. Jud.* 1, 8 § 5 ; *Antt.* 14, 5 §4).

When Julius Cæsar shortly after obtained the ascendancy, he abolished the form of government settled by Gabinius, restored the Sanhedrim, confirmed the pontificate in the family of Hyrcanus, and appointed Antipater procurator of the province, (*ἐπίτροπος τῆς Ἰουδάιας*). Antipater had two sons, Phasael, whom he made governor of Judea, and Herod, who was appointed governor of Galilee. In the struggle which now ensued, Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, with the purchased aid of the Parthians made a stroke for the crown, and succeeded for a while. Phasael destroyed himself by poison, and Hyrcanus, by bodily mutilation, was rendered unfit for the high-priesthood; but Herod meanwhile obtained a decree of the Roman Senate, appointing him king of Judea.

Now, in the lapse of these distressful years, the Sanhedrim had been gradually losing its civil prerogatives, but aggrandizing its importance as the seat of the Mosaic and traditional authority. Danger and calamity only render the law more endeared to the Jew, and fearful as the times often were, the rabbinical schools at Jerusalem were still peopled by increasing multitudes of students. From about 65—30 B. C., we find the presidency and vice-presidency of the Sanhedrim occupied by Shemaja (*Σαμέας*, Jos. *Antt.* 14, 9, 8.) and Abta-

lion (*Πολλίον,* Antt. 15, 1: 1, 10. 4). But the political relations, subsisting between Palestine and the Romans, prevented anything like independent action on the part of that tribunal; besides, Herod was not disposed to tolerate any independent authority co-ordinate with his own. His first appearance before the Sanhedrim even during the life time of Hyrcanus, when he occupied only a subordinate position, had already proved that he did not ackowledge its sacred character; for when summoned to answer for some arbitrary acts, he appeared at the head of a considerable force before the overawed Senate, not in the garb of a culprit, but armed from head to foot, and more like an accuser than one accused. Of all the Senators only Shemaja ventured to protest against this presumption. He reprobated energetically the insolent conduct of the youth, and Herod had to flee, but soon returned again at the head of an army to take vengeance, but was diverted only from the execution of his purpose by the entreaties of his father and brother, (Jos. Antt. 14, 9, 4).

Only very few enactments of these leaders of the Sanhedrim have come down to us, yet the influence which their great learning and unflinching integrity gave them among the people at large, and especially among the succeeding doctors of the law, was such as to secure for any question an authoritative reception if it could be traced to have been propounded by Shemaja and Abtalion, who were styled *the two magnates of their day.* The two recorded principles of these two doctors were: Shemaja said: "love thy trade, hate the dominion, and befriend not thyself with the worldly power," (Aboth 1, 10), whilst Abtalion said: "ye wise men, be careful in your utterances, lest ye be condemned to captivity, and led into exile, to places of obnoxious waters, from which if your pupils drink, they will die, whereby the name of God would be dishonored." (ib. v. ii). Both were held in great veneration by the good in Israel, and though neither of them was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, being both of proselyted fathers by Jewish mothers, yet "their works," it was said, "were as the works of the sons of Aaron," (Juchasin, fol. 17; Wolf,

Bibl. Hebr. iv, 378).* Great as was the learning, the integrity, and the influence of all the foregoing Scribes, yet Hillel I, who now succeeded to the presidential throne (B. C. 30—10 A. D.), surpassed in these and many other respects all his predecessors.

Hillel I, surnamed הזקן, or the Great,† called also the second Ezra, or the restorer of the law, under whose presidency Christ was born, was born in Babylon about 75 B. C., of poor parents, although descended in the female line from the house of David. He settled at Jerusalem about 37 B. C., where he had to support himself by the labor of his hands and attended at the same time the lectures of Shemaja and Abtalion, who were the heads of the Sanhedrim. So great was his thirst after knowledge, that he gave daily half of his scanty earnings to the door-keeper of the college, in order to be admitted to the lectures. One day his supply of money had failed, and he was refused admittance. Although in the depth of winter, the zealous scholar rather than lose the day's instruction, climbed from the outside up to the window, where he sat still till he was completely covered with snow, and rendered insensible by the cold. As the heap thus formed before the window, greatly obscured the light, it attracted the attention of Shemaja, and when the cause came to be examined, the body of Hillel was found under the snow, and apparently lifeless. Though it was on the Sabbath, the necessary remedies were procured, and he was restored to life. From that time on, Hillel was looked upon as the future guide, and became president of the Sanhedrim about 30 B. C. His cardinal doctrine and aim of life were "to be gentle, shewing all meekness to all men," and "when reviled not to revile again," and his grand dictum, since so widely propa-

* Graetz, *Gesch. d. Juden iii*, 481, rather thinks them to be Alexandrian Jews, and the notion of their having been proselytes rests upon the misinterpretation of a passage in the Talmud.

† On the merits of Hillel, comp. Delitzsch, *Jesus and Hillel*, with reference to Renan and Geiger, Erlangen, 1867, a translation of which the writer of this Article has ready in MSS.

gated, "do not unto another what thou wouldest not have another do unto thee."

It will not be out of place to speak here of those two advocates of Hillel, who through their attempts to set aside the claims of Jesus of Nazareth, in order to elevate their idol, have acquired much celebrity, viz. Mr. *Renan*, and the late Rabbi Geiger of Berlin. "Renan," says Dr. Liddon,* "suggests not without some hesitation that Hillel was the real teacher of Jesus."† "As an instance," says Mr. Liddon, "of our Lord's real independence of Hillel, a single example may suffice. A recent writer on "The Talmud," gives the following story: 'One day a heathen went to Shammai, the head of the rival academy, and asked him mockingly to convert him to the law, while he stood on one leg. The irate master turned him from the door. He then went to Hillel, who gave him that reply—*since so widely propagated*—'do not unto another, etc. This is the whole law, the rest is mere commentary.'‡ Or as Hillel's words are rendered by Lightfoot: 'Quod tibi ipsum odiosum est, proximo ne feceris: nam haec est tota lex.'§ The writer in the QUARTERLY REVIEW appears to assume the identity of Hillel's saying with the precept of our blessed Lord (Matt. 7 : 12; Luke 6 : 31).‖ Yet in truth how wide is the interval between the merely *negative* rule of the Jewish president, and the positive precept—'Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you,

---

* *Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of Christ*, New York, 1869, 4th ed., p. 107.

† "Hillel fut le vrai maitre de Jesus, s'il est permesé de parler de maitre quand il s'agit d'une si haute originalite." *Vie de Jesus*, p. 35.

‡QTARTERLY REVIEW, Oct., 1867, p. 441, Art. "The Talmud," reprinted in the *literary remains* of E. Deutsch, New York, 1874, p. 31.

§HORAE HEBRAICAE in MATTHAEUM, p. 129.

‖ No wonder. The writer of the QUART. REVIEW, was Mr. E. Deutsch, Librarian of the British Museum. The impression of the article was, that it was wrttten by a Christian, for the writer speaks of "our Saviour." But the expression of this modern Jew, sounds like Judas' "hail master, and kissed Him." The Jewish author hides himself behind the Christian mask. Beware of being bewitched with this German Judaizing novelty by making application to the old adage:—Timeo Danaos, ac sidona ferentes."—VIRGIL ÆNEID, II. 49.

do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets'—of the Divine Master." Thus far Mr. Liddon.

But whatever may be said of the precept, (Matt. 7 : 12) as to its being considered as a fresh discovery in moral science, most certainly Hillel cannot claim the merit of originality in respect to it. It existed long before his time. In the Apocryphal book Tobit, which was written most probably between 250—200 B. C., we read words like those which he used (ch. 4 : 15): "Do not to another that which thou hatest," and in Eccles. 31 : 15 (written about 290—280 B. C.) we read: "Judge of the disposition of thy neighbor by thyself, and in everything act with consideration." Ancient history bears ample testimony to the existence of this maxim among the ancient Greeks, long before the time of Hillel. *Diogenes Laertius* relates, that Aristotle (+ after 322 B. C.) being asked how we ought to carry ourselves to our friends, answered "as we would wish they would carry themselves to us." And Isocrates, who lived 400 years before the publication of the Gospel, said: "We must not do to others, that which would cause anger, if it were done to ourselves," &c. Even among the sayings of Confucius, the golden rule of the Saviour, which Luke designates as the foundation of all social virtue, this maxim is found in the negative form: "What you do not wish done to yourself, do not to others."

Dr. Delitzsch, in his pamphlet referred to (note p. 266) says: "Renan is yet too much of a Christian, that he should put Hillel above Jesus, though he praises him much, for he says: 'Though Hillel will never be looked upon as the real founder of Christianity,' Jesus however followed Hillel for the most part. Hillel had given utterance to aphorisms fifty years before, which greatly resembled his own. Dr. Geiger, however, the late Rabbi of the Jews at Berlin, in his lectures on "Judaism and its History," affirmed that Jesus was a Pharisee, and a follower of Hillel. *He never gave utterance to a new idea* (einen neuen gedanken sprach er keinesweges aus). "Hillel," he adds, "was a genuine reformer." But he never was a reformer. Dr. Geiger is the first to give him this name, and he does it merely to attempt to disparage Jesus.

As Dr. Delitzsch well observes: "A real reformer in a good sense of the word, is one who is endued with creative energy; who brings back the religion of a nation, which had become defaced and deformed, to its original state, and thus breathes new life into a great community, like that which it originally possessed. Samuel and Ezra were reformers of this class. Hillel changed nothing. He kept things as he found them. It is indeed true that he introduced a few innovations in the civil law concerning lending money and buying and selling, which suggest cunning contrivances for evading the laws of Moses, but in other respects, all he did was to carry out more fully the system of tradition taught by the Pharisees; he gave himself no trouble as to the religious state of the nation at large, and did nothing whatever to awaken religious life, which was in such a decayed state, or to give it a new impulse. History tells us what Jesus did. We have no need to write again this history. It is only necessary that we look at that which is actually before us, and do not wilfully shut our eyes. Hillel was no reformer. Where is the original form of the religion of his nation, as restored by him?"

We return again to Hillel. His learning was celebrated in hyperbolical language. It was said to have embraced not only Scripture and tradition, but languages, geography, natural history—in fact all sciences, human and superhuman. In the Talmud (Succa 28*a* & Baba Bathra 134*a*) we read, that Hillel had no less than one thousand pupils, of whom eighty were said to have been specially distinguished. Of these, thirty were described as worthy that the divine glory should rest upon them as it did upon Moses; thirty, that at their command the sun should stand still in the firmament, as in the case of Joshua, while only twenty were less noted. Amongst them Jonathan ben Uziel was the most distinguished, while Jochanan ben Saccai, was the least celebrated.

Hillel was the first who laid a regular system of hermeneutics for the interpretation of the written law, his so-called "seven rules:" 1, Inference from minor to major; 2, The analogy of ideas, or analogous inferences; 3, Analogy of two objects in one verse; 4, analogy of two objects in two verses;

5, General and special; 6, Analogy of another passage; 7, The connection.* Hillel also originated some changes in the management of the theological schools, and was the first to introduce the distinctive title of Rabban, Rabbi, and Rab, (the latter being applied to extra—Palestinian teachers).† He also introduced the so-called *Prosbul.* According to the Hebrew canons, the Sabbatical year cancels every debt, whether lent on a bill or not. It does not cancel accounts for goods, daily wages for labor, which may be performed in the Sabbatical year, unless they have been converted into a loan; or the legal fines imposed upon one who committed a rape, or was guilty of seduction (Exod. 20 : 11, 15, 16), or slander, or any judicial penalties; nor does it set aside a debt contracted on a pledge, or on a declaration made before the court of justice, at the time of lending, not to remit the debt in the Sabbatical year. The formula of this legal declaration was as follows: (וּפְלוֹנִי הַדַּיָּנִים שֶׁבְּמָקוֹם פְּלוֹנִי שֶׁכָּל חוֹב לִי שֶׁאִגַּבְנוּ כָּל זְמַן שֶׁאֶרְצֶה מוֹסֵר אֲנִי לָכֶם אִישׁ פְּלוֹנִי שֶׁיֵּשׁ) *i. e.* I, N. N. deliver to you, the judges of the district N., the declaration, that I may call in at any time I like all debts due to me," and it was signed either by the judges or witnesses. If this Prosbul was ante-dated it was legal, but it was invalid if post-dated. If one borrowed money from five different persons, a Prosbul was necessary from each individual; but if, on the contrary, one lent money to five different persons, one Prosbul was sufficient for all. This prosbul was introduced by Hillel because he found that the

*These seven rules of Hillel were afterwards enlarged by R. Ishmael to thirteen. In itself, these rules, as can be seen, are very sensible. In part they only contain the ever binding laws of logic, in part at least correct hermeneutical principles. But the praxis did not correspond with the theory, since in reality by means of these rules the most adventurous inferences were made, and the impossible were made possible, hence this pettifogging and hair-splitting, which we meet with so often in the Talmud, and by far surpasses the scholastic subtleties of the Mediæval Church.

†Rabban was the title of the president of the Sanhedrim, in contradistinction to the president of a college, who was styled Rabbi.

warning contained in Deut. 15 : 9 was disregarded, the rich would not lend to the poor for fear of the Sabbatical year, which seriously impeded commercial and social intercourse, (Mishna Shebüth 10 : 1—5 ; Gittin 4 : 3).

Hillel's apophthegms, which are handed down to us in the *Pirke Aboth*, are worthy of attention: "Separate not thyself from the congregation, and have no confidence in thyself till the day of thy death; judge not thy neighbor until thou art in his situation; say not, that something, which cannot be understood at present, that it will be understood at last; say not, I will repent when I shall have leisure, lest that leisure should never be thine; an ignorant man cannot properly abhor sin; a peasant cannot be pious, a bashful person cannot become learned, the passionate will never be a teacher, nor he who engages much in business a sage; in the place where there is not a man, be thou a man."

A poetical impromptu of his on seeing a skull floating on the water, conveys his idea of retribution:

"Because thou madest float,
They made thee float—
In turn who made thee float
Shall also float."

Another of his maxims was: "The more flesh, the more worms; the more wealth, the more care; the more wives, the more witchcraft; the more women-servants, the more vice; the more men-servants, the more robbery; but the more learning in the law, the more life; the more study, the more knowledge, the more counsel, the more prudence; the more righteousness, the more peace; he who gains a good name, gains it for himself, and he who gains the law, gains eternal life." (Aboth 2 : 5—8). "Be of the disciples of Aaron, who loved peace, and pursued peace, loving mankind and attracting them to the law."

"Each one who seeks a name
Shall only love his fame:
Who adds not to his lore
Shall lose it more and more:

Each one deserves to perish
Who study does not cherish :
That man shall surely fade
Who with his crown does trade."

"If I live not a holy life for myself, who can do it for me? And when I fully consider myself, what am I? and if not now, when shall I?" (b. 1 : 12—14).

Hillel died ten years after the birth of Christ. He was the founder of a family and race of hierarchs in the wisdom and administration of the law, who, in fifteen generations (A. D. 10—415) held the dignity of *nasim* or "patriarchs."

Of Shammai, Hillel's colleague, but comparatively little is known. Though one of his maxims was, "let the study of the law be fixed, say little and do much, and receive every one with the aspect of a fair countenance," (Aboth 1 : 15), "yet he is said to have been a man of a forbidding and uncompromising temper, and, in this respect, as in others, the counterpart of his illustrious companion, of whom, both in their dispositions and divisions on a multitude of rabbinical questions, he was, as we may say, the antithesis. Though each gave often a decision the reverse of the other, yet, by a sort of fiction in the practice of the schools, these contrary decisions were held to be co-ordinate in authority, and, if we may believe the Talmud, was confirmed as of like authority by a *Bath Kol* (a voice from heaven); or at least while a certain conclusion of Hillel's was affirmed, it was revealed that the opposite one of Shammai was not to be denied as heretical. Although both were rabbinically one, yet their disciples formed two irreconcilable parties, alike the Scotists and Thomists of the Middle Ages, whose mutual dissidence manifested itself not in the strife of words only, but also in that of blows, and, in some cases, of bloodshed. So great was the antagonism between them, that it was said, that "Elijah the Tishbite would never be able to reconcile the disciples of Hillel and Shammai."

The age of Hillel was, in many respects, the most distinguished. It was also that in which He appeared and came

"To heal all the wounds of the world
The Son of the Virgin was born."

Most, if not all the Rabbins, who lived at that period, as Papias, Ben Bagh Bagh, Jochanan the Horonite, and others, must have witnessed His advent, have taught during His lifetime, and had more or less share in His rejection and death. Considering the state of the synagogue, can we still wonder at this? Could their pride and exclusiveness, their wrangling and learning, their religious zeal and ardor, have found satisfaction in the life, the work, or teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, which were in direct antagonism with their own? Both systems could not co-exist. Either He or they must go down. His ascendancy would be their undoing.

Hillel was followed in the presidency by his son Simeon. Whether this Simeon is the same, as has been asserted by Athanasius and Epiphanius, who is described by St. Luke as embracing the infant Saviour in the Temple, cannot be ascertained.

The next in the presidency was Hillel's grandson, *Gamaliel I. the elder* (A. D. 30—50), the teacher of the apostle Paul, and the same who gave the temperate advice which led to the suspension of the persecution of the early Church. Among Jewish doctors, Gamaliel had been honored with the title of "Rabban." As Aquinas among the schoolmen was called *Doctor Angelicus*, and Bonaventura *Doctor Seraphicus*, so Gamaliel was called the "Beauty of the Law." He is held to have been the thirty-fifth receiver of the traditions from Mount Sinai; and he added to all the amplitude of Hebrew lore a large acquaintance with Gentile literature; the study of Greek being connived at, in his case, by his rabbinical brethren, on the plea of his having need of that language in diplomatic transactions with the secular government. A master also in the astronomy of that day, he could test, it is said, the witnesses for the new moon, by a chart of the lunar motions he had constructed for the purpose. His astronomic skill was employed also in the rectification of the Jewish calendar. It is recorded that he delighted much in the study

of nature, and in the beautiful in all its manifestations. In short, Gamaliel appears to have been a man of an enlarged and refined mind, and no very stringent Pharisee, though connected with the sect. Casual notices of him in the Talmud make this evident. Thus, he had a figure engraved upon his seal, a thing of which no strict Pharisee could approve. Nor could such an one have permitted himself to enter a public bath in which was a statue of Aphrodite. But this Gamaliel is reported to have done at Ptolemais, justifying himself by the argument that the bath had been built before the statue was there; that the building had been erected not as a temple, but as a bath, and as such he used it; and, moreover, that if it were not lawful for him to be except where idolatry had *not* held its rites, he should not be able to find a place to remain in upon the face of the earth. (Aboda Sarah III. iv.) "Far in advance of his times were his humane laws, that the poor heathen should have the same right as the poor Jews to gather the gleanings after the harvest, and that the Jews on meeting heathen should greet them—'peace be with you'—even on their festival days when they are mostly engaged in worshiping their idols. It was owing to these laws, which redound to the honor of Gamaliel, that it afterwards became customary to make equal provisions for the poor heathen and Jews, to attend to the sick heathen, to bestow the last honors on their dead, and to comfort their mourners, in towns which were inhabited by Jews and Gentiles, (Gittin 59*b*; 61 sq.; Jerus. Gittin c. 5).

The attitude assumed by Gamaliel toward the Christians, has induced others to surmise that this distinguished Rabbi was at heart a believer in Jesus, and that he was openly baptized before his death by St. Peter and St. Paul, together with his son Gamaliel and Nicodemus. But these notices are altogether irreconcilable with the esteem and respect in which he was held in later times by the Jewish rabbins, and who never doubted the soundness of his creed.* "Indeed

*Though the historical evidence is against tradition, respecting the baptism of Gamaliel, Grätz (Gesch. d. Juden, iv. p. 437) tells us, that

the two systems of Judaism and Christianity had now become so strongly defined, as to render neutrality in the case of a man so publicly known impossible. Jews and Christians, as such, could no longer coalesce. One cause was the antagonism of Christianity to the corruptions with which Rabbinism had damaged the Jewish system. For while the new communion had accepted all the truths, and retained all the permanent realities of the O. T. dispensation, it speedily, and in the spirit inculcated by the teachings of its Divine Founder, disengaged itself from the human and oppressive additions of the Sopherim. But as these mischievous corruptions had become the religion, so to speak, of the mass of the people, as well as an effective apparatus of government in the practice of their spiritual rulers, the propagators of the new faith found it extremely difficult to make a favorable impression on the nation at large. Then the catholicity of the evangelical dispensation was opposed to the favorite ideas of the Jewish mind. The elect people identified with the reign of the expected Deliverer their own ascendancy over a vassal world; but the Gospel proclaimed the advent of the Messiah of all nations, whose sceptre was to shed equal blessings on all the tribes of the earth. The Saviour of our race had been manifested, not to aggrandize a sect, but to redeem a world; to be a light to illumine the Gentiles, as well as to be the glory of his people Israel." (Etheridge).

---

in a Church at Pisa, the tomb of Gamaliel the elder was shown, who was converted to Christianity, and whom the Church canonized. The tomb, which contains the remains of many such converts, bears the following inscription:

> Hoc in Sarcophago requiescent corpora sacra
> Sanctorum. * * Sanctus Gamaliel. * *
> Gamaliel divi Pauli didasculus olim,
> Doctor et excellens Israelita fuit,
> Concilii magni fideique peromnia cultor.

This statement, however contradicts Jewish tradition, according to which Gamaliel was buried in Jamnia or Jabne, and whose tomb was visited by Parchi in the fourteenth century, (cf. Zunz, in Asher's "Benjamin of Judela, ii. pp. 439, 440).

Some time after his elevation to the presidency, Gamaliel, pressed by the distresses of time, transferred the locality of the synhedrical schools from Jerusalem to Jamnia, or Jabne, a town near the shores of the Mediterranean, and between the ancient cities of Joppa and Ashdod. He there completed the labors of his life, and died some fifteen years before the final ruin of his country. At his decease men said that "the glory of the law had ceased, and purity and abstinence died away." (Mishna Sota ix, 15).

The recorded theological principle of Gamaliel expresses his adherence to traditionalism, and his abhorrence of Pharisaical wrangling and hypocritical over-scrupulousness. It is: "Procure thyself a teacher, avoid being in doubt, and do not accustom thyself to give tithes by guess." (Aboth 1, 16.

Of Simeon II, the son of Gamaliel I, (50—10 A. D.), little is known, save that he took an active part in the defence of Jerusalem and fell one of the many victims of the national struggle, called the "killed for the kingdom."

Contemporary with Gamaliel, was Jochanan ben Saccai, (probably the same John who is mentioned as one of the members of that council before which the apostles were summoned (Acts 4 : 6). There is no doubt that the interview on that occasion with the apostles, impressed itself so deeply upon his mind, that he never could have effaced it from his memory, and we connect with it that anguish of spirit about his eternal state which Jochanan displayed on his deathbed.

After the destruction of Jerusalem, Jochanan convoked a Sanhedrim at Jamnia, (whither the synodical schools had already been transferred by Gamaliel), of which he was chosen Abba or president. In the hands of this council the work of transforming and adapting Judaism to the altered political circumstances proved a task of little difficulty. Jamnia had only to be substituted for Jerusalem, a few ordinances to be discontinued or slightly altered, and certain prayers or good works to be substituted for the sacrifices, and the change was effected without leaving any trace of violent revolution. In principle, Jochanan was a Hillelite, while in his practice, he followed the school of Shammai. It

was his fundamental principle: "If thou hast much learned in this law, attribute it not to thy goodness; seeing thou hast been created for that very purpose." (Aboth 2 : 8). He died on his bed in the arms of his disciples. His dying words were—"Fear God ever as you fear men." His disciples seemed astonished. He added—"He who would commit a sin, first looks round to discover whether any man sees him; so take ye heed, that God's all-seeing eye see not the sinful thought in your heart." There is another of his last words, which show what St. Paul calls "the spirit of bondage unto fear," (Rom. 8 : 5,) under which even virtuous men under the Jewish dispensation lived and died. His disciples addressed him: "Rabbi, light of Israel, thou strong rock, right hand pillar, why dost thou weep?" He answered them: "If they were about to lead me before a king of flesh and blood, who is to-day here, and to-morrow in the grave, who if he were angry with me, his anger would not last for ever; if he put me in bondage, his bondage would not be everlasting: and if he condemned me to death, that death would not be eternal, whom I could soothe with words and bribe with money; yet even in these circumstances I should weep. But now I am about to appear before the awful majesty of the King of kings, before the Holy and Blessed One, who is, and who liveth for ever, whose just anger may be eternal, who may doom me to everlasting punishment. Should He condemn me, it will be to death without further hope. Nor can I pacify Him with words, nor bribe Him with money. There are two roads before me, one leading to Paradise, the other to Hell, and I know not by which of these I go: should I not weep?" We see thus, in Jochanan's life and death a signal instance of the unsatisfactory character of Rabbinism. Even this famous man was made to feel and exemplify, that "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified." Lightfoot in the spirit of his time and opinion says insultingly: "Oh the wretched and failing faith of a Pharisee in the hour of death," (*academiae Japnensis historiae fragmenta*, *I*, p. 446, ed. Pitman), and a modern writer remarks on these words of Jochanan "what a contrast is presented in the his-

tory of a disciple of the celebrated Rabban Gamaliel, one who had profited above many of his equals in age in the Jew's religion, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of his fathers. He had cast them off; he had counted them loss for Christ, and now, in the prospect of eternity, exultingly exclaims: 'henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me at that day;' and in the animating prospect of the Redeemer's triumph over death, leads on the Christian hosts with the exultant shout, 'O death where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? thanks be to God which giveth us the victory, through Jesus the Messiah, our Lord." Reynolds, *Six Lectures on the Jews*, London, 1847, p. 131 sq.

We have thus sketched the lives of the most famous scribes down to the times, when the temple was in ashes, and Jerusalem a heap of ruins.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION WITHOUT GOD.

By C. A. Stork, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

On Washington's birth-day, which happens also to be Commemoration-Day at Johns Hopkins University of Baltimore, Pres. Eliot of Harvard made an address in the Hall of the University on *Higher*, or, as he termed it, *Superior Education.* His remarks were brief and, save on one point, noticeable only for the superfluity of contempt poured out on the smaller Colleges. The point alluded to I propose to take as a text for some observations on the new function that culture seems in the minds of many to be taking on itself.

"The years, he said, have been times of depression and he feared of humiliation to the American people. Many persons hold that the republic can be saved by primary education, but the most despotic government in the world, that of Germany, is that where primary education is most widespread. Despots can reconcile themselves to universal pri-

mary education, but cannot overcome the influence of universal education of a higher type. Well-conducted superior education, the training in knowledge, in writing and speaking of the natural leaders of the people, is the need of this country.

"Heretofore this has been imperfectly done; but it is not alone among the ignorant that are found the advocates of the dangerous measures which threaten the welfare of our country. The influence of superior education, subtle but universal, leads to a high sentiment of honor, and no nation can be happy or strong without it. It is a patriotic work that the Universities of this country should unite in."

The sentiments here expressed are not in themselves novel or doubtful. They only say in a mode adapted to the exigencies of our day, what has been said a great many times. "Well conducted superior education *is* a need of this country;" "the influenee of superior education, *does* tend to a high sentiment of honor." As for the assertion about despots being unable to "overcome the influence of education of a higher type," there will be in the minds of those who recall the history of Athens, the complaisance of French professors and *savants* under the Second Empire, and the like passages in the history of civilization, to say nothing of Germany, some difference of opinion. One thing only on this point we are sure of, and that is that despotism can never flourish among a people taught to value religious liberty, the sacredness of the conscience.

It is not so much the sentiments expressed as the new light they take from their setting, that makes them worthy of consideration. Let us look at the peculiar circumstances under which they were spoken. Johns Hopkins University is the latest and probably the strongest of that new type of higher educational establishments springing up in our country, which propose to educate men without any regard to their religious nature. We say nothing about the expediency of that sort of culture; nothing of the absurdity of a scheme of symmetrical training and enlightening which shuts out of its curriculum one whole side of human nature; for I suppose

we have hardly come to the point yet of denying that there is such a thing as religion, and that man has a religious nature. We only say that the secular Universities shut their eyes to that side of human nature: and that Johns Hopkins University is perhaps the best, most characteristic type of that class of establishments. I suppose the founders of this University would not object to take for the motto of their establishment the secularist sentence, "You cannot live for both worlds, because you do not know *both.* You know but *one.* Live for the one you do know." And that, I take it, expresses also the views Pres. Eliot would inculcate in his own University, if he had the ordering of things after his own notions,—notions which are very liberal and humane in all respects, save in this one point that they have no eye for what men generally recognize as the religious. This our two Presidents, Gilman and Eliot, will probably say is no great defect: one of them perhaps would claim it as a merit. This, however, is aside from the point of view we wish to take.

What we wish to point out, is that Pres. Eliot's sentiments about superior education being a protection against corruption and immorality mean something very different in his mouth and spoken in the hall of Johns Hopkins University from those same sentiments uttered by an avowed believer in Christianity speaking before a University founded in the interests of learning and religion. If Dr. Woolsey had spoken these same words at Princeton, we would all supply the *lacunae*; we would know that he called superior education a protection against corruption, and a guide to a high sentiment of honor only as a force working in harmony with religion. We would know that while he was speaking of the handmaid his eye was really on the mistress. But when Pres. Eliot speaks in the hall of John Hopkins we cannot suppose there are any unspoken references in his address; he does not have in his eye the mistress standing behind her maiden; he does not believe there is any mistress, or if there is, that we can know or teach any thing about her. He and the University he addresses know nothing about supernatural

power. They believe in what they can see and demonstrate. So when he says that "superior education leads to a high sentiment of honor, and no nation can be happy or strong without it," he means that this is sufficient alone. He has arranged his counteracting forces that are to resist the dangerous elements that threaten society—there they are—"superior education, subtle and universal," with God and religion and conscience, so far as that has any supernatural authority, left out.

It is very evident what President Eliot had before his mind's eye when he called for the purifying agencies of "Superior Education:" he was thinking of the Silver Bill, and the high carnival of folly and fraud in Congress, and the wild tumult of the great sea of popular passion and ignorance roaring for cheap money. The whole spectacle shocked him. It seemed to him dreadful that men should be so led away by passion and unreasoning self-interest. In short he had suddenly come in contact with the natural man. Perhaps the President of Harvard would not recognize whom we mean by that term. He will be thinking of some theological abstraction, some quiddity of the school-men. But really the last thing in the world we would say about 'the natural man,' is that he is a theological abstraction, a metaphysical quiddity: he is only too real. The theologians did not make him; the school-men did not cogitate him. They found him, not in their studies, in dim recondite gropings through labyrinths of abstract speculation, but on the street, at the table, in the shop, on the throne, in the gutter, even in the university; and it was because he gave them such a world of trouble, not metaphysical, notional trouble, but practical trouble; because he robbed them and beat them, violated their wives, cut their throats, and when he was not quite so violent as that, envied them, maligned, sneered at them, coveted their goods, and even when he was educated, was a selfish, egotistic, self-complacent, nambitious, prou creature, making no end of trouble even in the most highly cultured circles, that they made such an ado about him, and

even came to the conclusion, no doubt very absurd in Pres. Eliot's eyes, that some force above nature, a supernatural power, was needed to reform him and make him what he ought to be. This last conclusion it was among other things that made them insist so strenuously on another speculative idea, which Pres. Eliot and other friends of "Superior Education" think very light of by—the being of God.

But let us stick to our new discovery, for such it doubtless must seem to Pres. Eliot,—'the natural man.' If the name is obnoxious to the friends of "superior education," perhaps some other term might be found. We will not quarrel about names; it is the thing we want; and about that we are nearly all agreed—even Pres. Eliot has a certain dread mixed with perplexity at this quality in man, (that which the theologians call the 'natural man'), which drives him to eat and drink too much, to get his own way, to trample on his neighbor's rights, to steal, to cheat, to lie, to be vicious, to envy and hate, to quarrel, to behave himself, in short, in such a way, that, however we may philosophise about the cause, or the responsibility connected with it, we all ask how can we cure him? Yes, that is the question, the practical question about the whole matter; and that is really the great drift of revealed religion,—to get the 'natural man changed. It does not take much study of the Bible to find out that its aim is not so much to speculate about this 'natural man,' to philosophise on the unknowable, as it is to cure him.

But a "superior education" has no room for so primary a work on morals as the Bible. Then it must confront the problem alone. Here is the 'natural man;' he is still vicious, unaccountably fond of vile ways, with a real love for rascality, unamenable to reason, unchangeable by any kind of government or educational manipulation. All sorts of polities, social atmospheres, sanitary measures, educational remedies, have been applied to him, and nothing has ever done him any good, but religion. Even that has not restrained him much, but yet it has restrained. He changes his plan of operations, he transforms his outward appearance, but at bottom, in his heart, he is the same natural man. He is no longer a soul-

less Greek given over to unnatural vices. He has got over his ferocious carnivorous mood, when he was a Roman. He is no free-booting baron of the Middle Ages; he does not drink himself under the table every night, after the style of Queen Anne's age. But here he is the same inwardly bad fellow. He appears in all sorts of shapes, we all have something of him in us; but just now his great demonstration is as the silver-man, or rather as the debtor seeking to outwit his creditor. It is in this capacity that he alarms Pres. Eliot, and sets him to prescribing his nostrum of "superior education."

Now here is where the new friends of morality, those who would have a morality without any religion, or at least without any God, part company with those who believe in supernatural religion. We are all agreed, that there is such a thing as virtue, that morality is a good thing, nay, that it is an absolute necessity for man. We are all agreed as to a disposition in man to do a great many things he ought not, a certain craze, or disease that drives him into bad conduct. Here the religion and non-religion part company. We say, man goes wrong because he has broken loose from God, and there will be no cure for his bad disposition, no real permanent stay to his folly and immorality, till he has been brought back to God; in short the only cure for the natural man is religion. But Pres. Eliot says, no, the "superior education" will set him right.

It is a gain, though not a very great gain, that the advocates of the regeneration of the race by education, have been driven to qualify their faith in the reforming power of knowledge. It is no longer education, but only "superior education" that can make man what he ought to be. Time was, and that not so long ago, when we heard on every hand, only teach the people, give them light, and crime and vice and sin will gradually slink out of sight. But now it appears that only a great deal of light of the very highest order will answer. Pres. Eliot admits that primary education is no security against despotism; he tacitly admits that mere common schools will not make the people honest. So

much is gained. Not much it is true; the wonder is it was not seen long ago that mere reading and writing, the multiplication table, and a smattering of geography and grammar, could not cure a man's bad disposition. How could they? In what relation does a knowledge of the alphabet, the ability to read the newspaper, or to add up a column of figures, stand to a man's indulgence of his appetites? Why should a knowledge of book-keeping by double entry make me less selfish? Well, we are past that.

But now we are told the "superior education" will be our salvation. But pray how?

The "superior education" as far as the matter of it goes, is only primary education carried further on. It does not give anything different in kind from the curriculum of the small college. It takes up the natural sciences and gives fuller, deeper, more minute instruction; it takes up letters and trains a fine perception; it takes up the fine arts, and on this Pres. Eliot lays special stress, but it really gives nothing that differs in the direction of its influence from what belongs to all education, be it higher or lower. What, I say then, is there in this fuller, minuter, knowledge that cures the natural man! Is there anything more corrective to the appetite in the theory of curves than there is in the rule of three? Would a fine discrimination in the niceties of the endless schools of Italian painting make a man less selfish?

But perhaps by "superior education" is meant the effect produced on the mind by a great breadth of view; the more advanced the culture, the more complex of course the combination of new ideas. By knowing a great deal about a vast number of fields, and by the habit of mind formed in the mastery of this knowledge, in investigation, by sifting, comparing, and arranging one's knowledge there is formed a very different texture of mind from that produced in a limited education. But after all it is only a matter of degree. There is no point where you can draw the line, and say, on this side education is *primary* and so incapable of acting as a great moral agent, on the other it is *superior* and becomes a spiritual force.

The whole theory of regenerating man by education is based on the assumption, that what cures a bad disposition is light. One is tempted here to repeat what the great Master of morals, of conduct, said about the effect of light on man's bad disposition, that the trouble with men was not that they had not light, but that when light came they did not want it, that they refused it, and fought against it. But to keep to our line of argument: we say no amount of information, of breadth of view, of training of the reasoning powers, and of the faculties of taste, is going to have the slightest effect by itself on man's conduct. For that is wrong not by defect of knowledge, or narrowness of outlook, or weakness of the logical faculty, or faultiness of the eye or ear; but by a positive quality. It is a positive force that will go after what it wants. And when the pagan poet said "I see the better but the worse pursue," he described just the case we have to deal with, that if a being who goes wrong when he has plenty of light, who goes wrong because he has a force in him that nerves itself, that chooses to defy what is right.

It has been so over and over again in the history of the world. Men have had a fair start again and again; and again and again they have, despite all the *superior education* afforded them, (and some of it has been much superior to anything that can be had at Harvard or Johns Hopkins,) gone steadily down. They have had it in Egypt, in Greece, in Rome, in every great country in Europe. And always an unaccountable element showed itself, a vicious element, and in spite of all efforts it conquered every time. Nothing yet has ever eliminated it: reverse the terms, put them how you will, there the bad quantity appears, not a negative, but a pressing, positive quantity; a quality that bites-in, that eats through everything, national character, literary culture, refined taste, primitive simplicity, inherited virtues. When we are told then, as we watch with dread the outbreak of this natural man in the socialistic movements of the day, that a higher culture, more natural science, and letters, and fine arts, and mental breadth, is going to be the cure, we are thrown out; we cannot see how the two stand related. What

has any amount of knowledge or mental training to do with a wish, a disposition? The medicine does not get down to the spot. It does not get at the will, the inner man.

Theology has its own solution of the problem, and declares that it can be worked out succesfully. In fact religion does succeed in eliminating this bad quality. It has done it in millions of cases. It does, by the admission of statesmen and philosophers of every age, put a great restraint on the natural man. The only reason it does not do more is because on its own confession the force to be opposed is so terrible, so indomitable, so almost super-human; it has had a hard fight thus far with the natural man, but it is on the way to win.

But what has "superior education" to say of *its* success? What force is there in it? None. It does not even suffice to keep the philosopher in order himself. What, then, can it do outside?

The appeal it will be urged, however, must be to facts, the high *a priroi* road of discussion will only lead us out into the wilderness. Well, what are the facts,? It must be confessed as things are arranged in this world it will be a long time before the experiment can be fully tried. As men are situated, considering what is required for high culture, all the vast forces of leisure, means, apparatus, and natural aptitude for training, it seems hopeless to expect that "superior education" shall ever be possible to more than a mere fraction, and that an infinitesimally small one, of the race. Nothing short of a miracle could provide "superior education" for any but a handful of leaders. So if we are to wait till their advanced training takes the natural man into hand, we may as well give the thing up, at least for this cycle of history. Perhaps however it is hoped that from this high mount of privilege, from this aristocratic group of culture, there will descend powerful influence on the masses; as Pres. Eliot puts it "*an influence of superior education subtle but universal.*" But this of course is mere speculation, too, we are still on the high *a priori* road. Let us get down if we can to the common dirt road of *facts.* What are the facts about *superior education* divorced from religion.

Perhaps the most perfect realization of the ideal of "superior education" made general, is to be found in the case of Athens. When we think of a University, nothing so fills the general notion as that picture of the great city when she was, as Pericles said, the "schoolmistress" of Greece; not the "mistress" of a primary school, but of a liberal, subtle, penetrating, various culture, in short a true University: "To what foreign land," said a Syracusan, when ruin threatened her, "to what foreign land will men betake themselves for liberal education if Athens be destroyed?" The training she afforded was of that highest kind which does not depend on books, and rules, on the following of the letter. Men did not flock there to read books, to con lessons. It is said that in the age of Plato, there was not a book store in Athens. It was the kind of education of which Pres. Eliot makes such account, when he says, that honor and high tone are caught from contact with noble minds. And so it was at Athens. "A people so speculative," says a writer on University training, "so imaginative, who throve upon mental activity as other races upon mental repose, and to whom it came as natural to think, as to a barbarian to smoke or to sleep. Such a people were in a true sense born teachers, and merely to live among them was a cultivation of mind."

That was a true University, coming nearer to the realization of our ideal of a broad, a subtle and penetrating culture, that not only instructs and trains the man, but really enters into the fibre of his nature and new-makes it, than anything the world has seen before or since. Without disparaging the atmosphere and influence of Oxford, or Harvard, or Johns Hopkins, which are very noble and potent, one feels that they and all their apparatus would show, by the side of this ancient university city, a very meagre aspect. Take the charming picture of this great city, mistress of culture, drawn by Dr. Newman in his famous Chapter on University Life at Athens,—with its sculptures of Phidias, its paintings of Polygnotus, its dramas of Sophocles and Æschylus, its Agora swayed by Lysias and Demosthenes, its tombs of the mighty dead with Pericles declaiming among them, its Aca-

deme where the presence of Plato is a school without his words, its Lyceum where Aristotle paces to and fro discussing with his pupils, its garden where Epicurus reclines, its porch with Zeno sitting there,—look at this picture, I say, and then when we have grasped the idea of a culture so genial, so penetrating, so omnipresent to every part of our human nature, so transforming, let us think of our great Universities, and do they not seem as rude barbarian establishments, very vigorous, but very raw? I fancy I see an accomplished Athenian repaying with interest the contempt which Pres. Eliot pours out so lavishly on the small Colleges. He would go round to the libraries and the museums, he would listen to the recitations of the undergraduates in mathematics and rhetoric; he would visit the art-galleries; he would attend the lectures of Mr. Fiske in Cosmic Philosophy; he would hear what Presidents Eliot and Gilman have to say about the true, the beautiful, and the good; he would be present at the Commencement Exercises;—and what would he think of it all? Would he wish that he could have been born two thousand years later, so he might have sat at the feet of Mr. Fiske, and heard Dr. Eliot lecture on chemistry? Would he exchange the company of Plato, the sway of Pericles, for the lectures of Mr. Huxley on Evolution, and Mr. Tyndall's interesting experiments on light?

Well, we have, then, the ideal University with the perfection of culture, derived from contact with the noblest of minds: and what is the result? In politics that master-demagogue, that father of all blatherskites, Cleon, steps into the vacant place of Pericles: we have presently the cowardly populace now raging against Philip, now fleeing like sheep before him. We have the downward plunge of the whole community into frivolous baseness that at last made the name *Greek* a by-word; we have the nameless vices that spread pollution along the shores of Italy: we have what one sees in the museum "*oggetti osceni*" at Naples. We have a national degeneracy so wretched, so disintegrating that the last we see of Athens she is creeping like a whipped hound at the feet of Rome, alternately licking and biting the hand

of her master. And all this in spite of "the influence of superior education" of the subtlest kind. The 'natural man' was too much for Athens.

But perhaps it will seem to some that our modern culture differs from the standard of the ancient world, by adding an entirely new element. So, for instance, Mr. Huxley thinks: he has not much opinion of the kind of training afforded by Athens. That whole culture by music, geometry, and the general refinement of the nature by the study of the beautiful, he has stigmatized as a "*sensual caterwauling.*" He does not do this directly, but indirectly, holding up such unfortunates as Mr. Pater, and Mr. Swinburne, the advocates generally of culture as distinguished from science, as objects of contempt to the well-regulated scientific mind. It is science that makes all the difference in our modern education: we have the Baconian method; we deal with facts; we have learned to teach by "object lessons;" we are not "satisfied with telling our child that a magnet attracts iron. We let him see that it does. And especially tell him that it is his duty to doubt until he is compelled by the absolute authority of Nature, to believe that which is written in books;" and by "the authority of Nature" we mean what can be tested by weights, and retorts, and crucibles, what we can see, or feel, or weigh. This is the grand secret of the modern "superior education." Far be it from us to say any thing disrespectful of the study of the natural sciences The habit of mind induced by the scrutiny of nature in the modern methods, is one that has been productive of the greatest benefits. It has been a training for exactness, reality, sobriety. But what we say is, that even this is no cure for the 'natural man.'

It is useless to discuss the question on *a priori* grounds, though one is tempted to follow out the line of Mr. Tyndall's last words on the doctrine of Necessity, thus:—given the doctrine that man is so thoroughly a part of nature that he *must* do whatever he does, and given this teaching as a part of "superior education," what will be the result of such indoctrination when filtered down to the average man? But

let us keep to the facts. What has modern education of the higher sort done to fortify virtue, to make man humble and gentle and kind and just? It is rather early to look for very decided results. Religion still holds the field: she tinctures the thoughts of men, not only by the influence she exerts through the religious part of the cultivated world, but also by the hold through association, and the old education she still has on those who have professedly turned their backs on her. Mr. Huxley, and Prof. Clifford, and Mr. Morley, and all the apostles of the gospel of scientific enlightenment, though they speak so bitterly of religion, are yet full of religious prepossessions and feelings. They have cut loose from God, but they have not destroyed the impetus of that old idea of God in their mental motives. And so they talk in the most edifying way about conscience and duty, and the sacredness of truth, and a number of other things, which on their theories of life are mere questions of "lunar politics," the most unadulterated moonshine.

But already we are beginning to see what the "superior education" that casts off God will come to. In looking for these results, we need not restrict ourselves to the efforts among purely scientific inquirers; for the results of the modern devotion of mind simply to the facts of nature have gone out into every field of thought. The word of the day intellectually is '*we know what we see.*' And art has taken that word, history has taken it, philosophy has taken it: it is the watchword of the whole camp of modern culture. So when we look for the fruits of that spirit, we go throughout the whole domain of culture to find them.

If there is any doctrine of morals that seems to belong preeminently to our age, it is that of benevolence, charity, love. No age of the world has ever been so saturated with the feeling for man. It seems to be in the air: and if any doctrine of morals could live without root in religion, that, we say, would be the one. We have all become so afraid of inflicting pain, that it seems sometimes as if there were danger of society going to pieces for the difficulty there is in getting the very worst offender punished. But we find in the influ-

ence of "superior education" a current setting the other way. The philosophers do not believe in philanthropy. Mr. Emerson indignantly disavows the name: he does not love men: he would be ashamed of himself if he did. A great English law writer says explicitly, that he does not love any but respectable people, that if he had his way he would write his hatred and contempt of the great mass of men with the lash on their backs. M. Renan, the leader of culture in France, lays out a plan for the organization of the future, in which only the choice spirits are to have the good things, and the mass are to be satisfied with looking on at the happiness and glory of their betters, like poor street children flattening their noses against the glass, while they watch well-dressed gentlemen and ladies eating the beef and pudding within. Nor are these only names singled out by their eccentricity from a general mass that goes the other way. The disgust and impatience with the sick, the poor, the feeble, the remnants of society, shown by certain late discussions, all point the same way. We all remember the debate on "*euthanasia*," *i. e.* the expediency of putting persons who have incurable diseases out of their misery. At first it seemed that this was advocated as a mercy to the afflicted persons themselves; and the incurable was only to be put to death by his own consent; but as the discussion went on, it appeared that one great benefit in the minds of the proposers was the relief it would afford to society, to the friends: and then it was questioned whether in certain stages of diseases the mind might not be so affected that the patient was incapable of judging what was best for him, and the decision of life or death be left to his friends. The discussion was a little too much for society, and some strong expressions of disgust hushed the inquiry up. But there was enough of it to show what way our modern "superior education," with religion left out, will tend. Take also the state of mind displayed by the advocates of vivisection in England: it seems to that section of the educated mind of Great Britain which has broken with religion, to be something puerile that the claims of pity, and of the compassionate nature in man should stand in the way of what they are pleased to call the investigation of

truth. Any amount of torture to animals, and of consequent violence to our compassionate sympathy, seems to them nothing compared with the satisfaction of trying experiments on the nature of bile. This seems possibly like detecting a current by the evidence of a very few straws. But then the straws all float the same way. Listen to the tone in which the cultured world, that rejects religion, talks of help extended to the weak, to the incurably sick, to the diseased in mind; its general expression of disbelief in any curative efforts, its general disgust at all moral reform; its unmeasured contempt for the work of Foreign Missions.

All this falls in with the inevitable drift of the doctrine of the *survival of the fittest* applied to life as a universal law. Indeed, if I am persuaded deeply that nature is only a complex sieve, which is eternally sifting out the inferior and garnering the choice, then no amount of inherited instincts, or associated, feelings are going to keep me from gradually making that law of nature my law of conduct. Why should I save what is doomed by nature as unsaveable? My compassion, my unfortunate thin-skinnedness of feeling may make me struggle with the inevitable current for awhile. But my struggles will grow feebler: my faith, (for that is what the belief in evolution really is), my faith in this all-embracing law that goes on casting out the poor and weak, must at last mould my conduct. And it ought to do so. If there be any validity in one's sense of duty, there is no escape from it that we must follow what we see to be the line of truth; and if nature is slowly bolting the grain of life, throwing out the chaff of the weak, the sick, the ignorant, and saving only the wheat, then it is not only useless for me to seek to reserve the chaff, it is wicked. Prof. Clifford and Mr. Morley would say, yes, to this, I think. Mr. Huxley and Mr. Tyndall would not say so yet; but it is hard to see how they can escape from going over the falls now they have got into the rapids. As for Pres. Eliot and Pres. Gilman, of course they indignantly disavow such principles; but those that occupy their chairs in the next generation, if they have got all their culture only from their "superior education," will not disa-

vow them so emphatically. If you want to know what fruit doctrine bears, do not examine the lives of the original teachers, but those of their pupils.

But there is another class of mind which applies the "superior education" in another direction, that is just as fatal to all hope of curing the natural man by the influence of a higher culture. One of the most curious signs of the times is the reproduction of the old Greek paganism among us; the philosophy of the Garden, that true wisdom is to get the most we can out of this life in the way of enjoyment, regardless of all else; "*carpe diem.*" And this too is the outcome of our modern scientific thought, cut loose from God. Mr. Huxley and his severe scientific friends may kick against it as much as they please, but there it is, Mr. Pater, and the school he so exquisitely represents, are the children of the phenomenal philosophy: "You know only phenomena, what you see and feel; you cannot know the eternal; you must be satisfied with the visible;"—so Mr. Huxley and Mr. Tyndall, and then under the influence of a strong taste for the investigation of natural facts, they continue, "let us go on to find out more truth, and to tell others." But at Mr. Huxley's elbow stands Mr. Pater; he hears this dictum, that we have only the present; we know only phenomena; and he says, well then let us enjoy the present. Mr. Huxley may go on investigating, experimenting, discovering natural laws; let him if he likes it. But, says Mr. Pater, I will enjoy: "While all melts under our feet, we may well catch at any exquisite passion, or any contribution to knowledge that seems, by a lifted horizon, to set the spirit free for a moment, or any stirring of the senses, strange dyes, strange flowers, and curious odors, or work of artistic hands. With this sense of the splendor of our experience and of its awful brevity, gathering all we are into one desperate effort to see and touch, we shall hardly have time to make theories about the things we see and touch. * * The theory, or idea, or system, which requires of us the sacrifice of any part of this experience, in consideration of some interest into which we cannot enter, or some

abstract morality we have not identified with ourselves, or what is only conventional, has no real claim upon us."

I am afraid Mr. Huxley and his scientific friends will call this only 'sensual caterwauling:' it does sound, I confess, rather sensual, rather selfish; it is only paganism;—"live while you live;"—"let us eat, drink and be merry; to-morrow we die." But what is to be observed is that it is one actual inference from the reigning philosophy of the schools. And when this "superior education," which teaches men of facts, of the visible, of this present course of things, disconnected from God, from any hereafter, or any day of accounts, disconnected from conscience as a supernatural and authoritative voice within the soul,—when such education, I say, sends down its influence to touch the natural man, what power will it have to check in him the restless, indefatigable impulse to gratify the present feelings, to go wrong, to be base, brutal, lustful, selfish? If Mr. Pater and Mr. Swinburne, and the rest of our exquisitely refined, and acuminated gentlemen, all say let us gather "all we are into one desperate effort to see and touch," what will the average natural man say? Will he say, "let us pay our debts like honest men?" Why, if Mr. Pater declines to sacrifice any part of this experience of enjoyment, in consideration of "some abstract morality," shall we expect the silver man to tax himself 10 per cent. more to gratify such an abstract bit of morality as the maintenance of the national honor?

If the "superior education" were to be tried, so to speak, in a moral vacuum, if there were no predisposing elements at work, then the dream of making it a moral governor might have some plausibility. But there is no vacuum: the ground is pre-occupied; the natural man is strongly moved to go in a wrong direction; he has been going that way a long time; the impulse in him is something tremendous; the whole force, of civilization and of the religion from which that civilization has sprung, have thus far barely availed to hold him in and slowly tame him. Now, let the "superior education," which says religion is only a beautiful fairy story, or as Prof.

Clifford calls it, an ugly superstition, go to him, and taking off the pressure that the belief in an unseen world, in a righteous and Almighty God, in a Judgment to come, and in an eternity of existence, has exerted, apply its restraining influence: let it tell him that the only world we know of is the present, that conscience is a growth of the race's development, that all we have is the present, and yet that he ought to make the most of himself, and live a pure and noble life, and what will be the effect? As a great writer says: "If we should ever see a generation of men, to whom the word God had no meaning at all, we should get a light upon the subject which might be lurid enough."

I have said what I wish to say. Of course Pres. Eliot and Pres. Gilman do not care for such consideration. They, and their fellow-laborers in the cause of secular education have their experience to try, and try it they will to the end. But we who believe in "superior education," we Christian teachers, who in the persons of those who have preceded us through the long generations of the past, have loved the light and sought it, wherever is was to be found, who have cherished it and kept its lamp from being blown out through dark ages, when Christianity was the sole guardian and lover of truth of any kind, we who rejoice in the great sweep of advancement, that the race is making in the knowledge of God's natural world, and who say to Science, "Go on, discover all you can, of the mechanism of this cosmos," we may say, when you unfasten education from the knowledge of God, then you give up the hope of the future. Nothing has ever yet tamed the natural man, but the fear of God; we do not believe anything else ever will.

ARTICLE IX.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

AMERICAN.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*Manual of Systematic Theology and Christian Ethics*, by Alvah Hovey, D. D., LL. D.; *The Seven Words from the Cross*, by W. H. Adams; *Orthodoxy*, Boston Monday Lectures, by Jos. Cook; *The Christian Creed*, its Theory and Practice, with a Preface on some Present Dangers of the English Church, by Rev. S. Leathes; *Masters in English Theology*, being the Kings College Lectures for 1877, ed. with a historical Preface by A. Barry, D. D.; *A Popular Exposition of the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia*, by H. E. Plumptre; *Daniel the Beloved*, by Rev. Wm. M. Taylor, D. D.; *All Saints' Day*, and other Sermons, by Rev. Chas. Kingsley, M. A., ed. by W. Harrison, M. A.; *The New Testament Commentary* for English Readers, by Various Writers, ed. by Chas. J. Ellicott, D. D., in three vols., vol. I.; *Home Life in Ancient Palestine*, Studies on the Book of Ruth, by Rev. A. Thomson, D. D.; *The Natural History of Atheism*, by Prof. J. S. Blackie; *Eternal Hope*, Five Sermons preached in Westminster Abbey, 1877, by Rev. F. W. Farrar.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*Elements of Geology*, a Text-Book for Colleges and for the general reader, by Jos. Le Conte, illus.; *Biology*, by Charles Letourneau, (vol. 2, Contemp. Science Ser.); *Comparative Psychology*, or the Growth and Grades of Intelligence, by John Bascom; *Popular Astronomy*, by Simon Newcomb, LL. D., 112 engravings and 5 maps; *Anthropology*, by Dr. Paul Topinard, with a Preface by Prof. Paul Broca, translated by Robt. T. H. Bartley, M. D., illus. (Library of Contemp. Science, vol. 3); *A Manual of the Anatomy of the Invertebrated Animals*, by Thos. H. Huxley; *The Ancient Life-History of the Earth*, a Comprehensive Outline of the Principles and Leading Facts of Palæontological Science, by H. Alleyne Nicholson, M. D., illus.; *The Epoch of the Mammoth, and the Apparition of Man upon the Earth*, by Jas. C. Southall, illus.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*Democracy in Europe*, by Thos. Erskine May, 2 vols.; *The Beginning of the Middle Ages*, by R. W. Church, (Epoch of Modern History) with 3 maps; *History of the English People*, by John R. Green, M. A., vol. I.; *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, by Wm. E. H. Lecky, 2 vols.; *The Life and Times of Thomas Becket*, by Jas. A Froude; *History of Germany from the Earliest Times*, by Charlton T. Lewis; *A History of Latin Literature*, by Leonard Schmitz, LL. D.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Dictionary of English Literature*, being a comprehensive Guide to English Authors and their works, by W. Davenport Adams; *The Coming Empire*, or Two Thousand Miles in Texas on Horse-back, by H. F. McDaniel and N. A. Taylor; *Pascal*, by Rev. Principal Tulloch, vol. 3, of Foreign classics for English Readers; *Between the Gates* by Benj. F. Taylor, author of "Songs of Yesterday," "Old Pictures," "World on Wheels," &c., with illustrations.

BRITISH.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*Basis of Faith*, Congregational Union Lectures, 1877, by E. R. Conder; *Seven Topics of the Christian Faith*, by P. Maclaren; *Four Gospels as Interpreted* by the Early Church, by F. H. Dunwell; *Bible Plants*, their History, etc., by J. Smith.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*Miscellaneous Papers connected* with *Physical Science*, by H. Lloyd.

HISTORICAL.—*History of Civilization in Scotland*, by J. Macintosh, vol. I.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*History of English Humor*, by A. G. L'Estrange, 2 vols., octavo; *Classic Preachers of the English Church*, lectures delivered at St. James's Church, with Introduction by J. E. Kempe; *Lapland Life*, or Summer Adventures in Arctic Regions, by D. D. Mackintosh; *Etymological Glossary* of nearly 2500 English words from the Greek, by E. J. Boyce.

GERMAN.

BIBLICAL.—*The Book of Job*, by Rev. W. Rogge, 120 pages, is a popular exposition of this book for the people. The same book has been put into German verse by Rev. G. Kemmler, in a volume entitled *Job, or Conflict and Victory in Suffering.* pp. 184. *The Idea of the Atonement in the Old Testament*, is a small volume, 88 pp., by Prof. Dr. Riehm, and is a reprint from the Studien and Kritiken.

In Meyer's critical exegetical Commentary on the N. T., the fourth edition of the commentary on 1 & 2 Eps. of Peter, and on Jude, by Dr. Huther, and the third edition of that on Revelation, by Dr. Duesterdieck, have appeared. These are revised editions. The important literature on these books which appeared since the last edition, is carefully considered.

The Idolatry and Enchantments of the ancient Hebrews and neighboring Nations, by Prof. Dr. Scholz. pp. 482. The book treats of the origin of Idolatry and then discusses the subject of the title. It is the result of much research, and besides the views of the author contains much material gathered from various sources.

The History of Creation, by Prof. Dr. Pfaff, pp. 753, discusses the scientific theories on this subject and also the account in Genesis.

HISTORICAL.—*History of the Christian Dogmas*, by Prof. Dr. Thomasius. 2 volumes, pp. 594 and 484. The first volume, which treats of the history of the dogmas of the early Church, appeared in 1864. The learned author died in Jan. 1875, before the second volume, on the history of doctrines in the Middle Ages and the Reformation could appear. The editing of this volume was therefore committed to his pupil, Dr. Plitt. The entire work is now complete. Thomasius regarded this as his favorite literary production, and for thirty years gathered the materials for it. The work is a lasting monument of the author's great learning and indefatigable research.

The Romish Church in the Nineteenth Century, by Prof. F. Nielsen. Translated from the Danish by A. Michelsen. vol. I., pp. 533. This is one of the many works occasioned by the recent political aggressions of the papacy. This volume gives the history of the papacy in this century, the second volume is to give the inner life in that church. The work is of a popular character.

The Ev. Lutheran Church of Russia, by Rev. F. Hunnius. pp. 132. This book gives a brief historical sketch and statistical view of the Lutheran Church in Russia. In that land there are, according to this volume, 4,024,035.

John Damascenus, by J. H. F. Grundlehner. pp. 255. In the first part the author gives an account of the life of Damascenus, in the second an account of his literary activity as systematic theologian, apologist, homilist, and hymnologist.

History of the City of Cologne, by Dr. Ennen. vol. iv. pp. 889. This vol. gives the history of the city during the Reformation.

The Reformation in the ecclesiastical Province of Cologne, by Rev. Drouven. pp. 409. J. H. W. S.

ARTICLE X.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

J. M. STODDART & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

The Encyclopædia Britannica. A Dictionary of the Arts, Sciences, and General Literature. Ninth Edition, (American Reprint). Vol. vii. pp. 721. 1878.

This is the seventh volume of this truly learned and valuable work. It comprehends the subjects within the Alphabetical range from Deacon to El Dorado, and includes not only a rich variety, but also many articles of great interest and importance. A goodly number of subjects are treated with a fullness that is most satisfactory. It is difficult to give any clear view of the contents of such a volume in a notice such as is common to a *Review*. We have been impressed with

the value of the articles in this volume on some leading subjects, a few of which may be mentioned. In *Biography* there is an array of such names as Defoe, Demosthenes, De Quincey, Descartes, Dickens. Diderot, Dryden, Dumas, etc., etc., and the articles seem to have been written by authors in sympathy with their subjects.

Geography and *History* are well represented. Egypt, with a fine map, occupies more than seventy pages. Delhi, Denmark, Dublin, Edinburgh, are among the articles under this head.

Science and *Art* receive special attention. The article on the *Distribution* of Life, Animal and vegetable, in Space and Time, covers thirty pages, and that on the Drama more than forty. Under *Education* the educational theories are traced from the earliest times to the present day, and much valuable matter furnished. The Theological and Biblical departments have not been overlooked. There are articles on Decalogue, Deism, Dogmatic, Ecclesiastes, etc. That on the Decalogue is by Prof. Smith, of the Free Church College, Aberdeen, whose article on the Bible, in a former volume, has caused so much controversy, and subjected the author to an ecclesiastical trial for his opinions on the Scriptures. The article on Dogmatic is one of the best in this department.

These are only mentioned as samples or illustrations of the character of the articles in this volume. Indeed as we turn over its pages we wonder at the research and industry displayed in its preparation. Nothing but the combined labors of a large number of contributors, each of whom has made a specialty of his field could produce a work like this. It will be a library in itself, and many a scholar, of fair acquirements has not in his whole library as much valuable literary and scientific material as will be found in this one real Encyclopædia. Our appreciation of its value increases with the appearance of the successive volumes, and the opportunities for further examination and consultation.

Notwithstanding the care so apparent in the preparation of the articles, we notice an occasional slip. In the very valuable article on "Denmark," accompanied by a well executed map, we find the following: "Of the 2088 persons who left Denmark in 1875, 1678 emigrated to the United States of America, 329 to Australia, 47 to Canada, and 34 to other points of America, including the Salt Lake City." Our English cousins should know that Uncle Sam claims Salt Lake City as included in the territory of "the United States of America." The article on "Dictionary," has a most formidable array of works in that department, in various languages ancient and modern, but our attention has been called to the omission under the heading "Latin" of so well known a work as Ramshorn's Latin Synonyms, and in "Greek" of Damm's Homeric Lexicon. But of nearly every thing this Encyclopædia treats, and there is not much that it does not touch, it is

a treasury. It is to be hoped that the enterprising publisher will be liberally rewarded for furnishing this neat and cheap "American Reprint."

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., PHIADELPHIA.

The Epoch of the Mammoth, and the Apparition of Man upon the Earth. By James C. Southall, A. M., LL. D., Author of the "Recent Origin of Man." With Illustrations. pp. xv.; 430. 1878.

The author of this volume, Dr. James C. Southall, of Richmond, Va., had become become pretty well known, both in this country and in England, by the publication, a few years ago, of his work on the "Recent Origin of Man." It came as a summons to halt, in the wild and visionary theories which professed scientists were offering to the world, in the name of true science ; and asked attention to plain and simple facts. Even the journals that had been foremost in heralding the new and popular views, admitted the vast amount of research and learning displayed, and gave significant indications that it was time to consider more carefully some of the conclusions hastily reached. It is not too much to say that there has already been a reaction, if not to the old interpretation of the Bible, at least to a much nearer approach to it than many were disposed to advocate a few years ago.

The drift of this volume is in the same general direction with that on the "Recent Origin of Man." The design is thus stated by the author himself: "The object of the present volume is to give in a compact form all that the investigations of the students of geology and prehistoric archæology have brought to light with regard to 'man's age in the world.'" It embraces, besides an interesting Preface, twenty-five chapters, with Addenda and a very full Index. This last mentioned particular makes the volume especially easy and valuable for consultation on particular points. The volume indicates great familiarity with the subject on the part of the author. He subjects to a critical examination some of the alleged facts and theories founded on them, and shows how utterly unscientific and untrustworthy they are. Sir Charles Lyell's 800,000 years, for the antiquity of man on the earth, which he himself had cut down to 200,000, suffers a further shrinkage until only a few thousand are left with any show of proof, Dr. Dowler's skeleton found in the river mud at New Orleans, and for which he claimed a period of 57,000 years, is shown to have no data requiring any such length of time. Other remains for which a fabulous period has been argued, are proved by simple facts not to ante-date a very few thousand years. It is indeed surprising how hundreds of thousands of years vanish before the touch of a few simpls facts, and splendid theories are left without any support.

Special importance seems to be attached in this volume to the Glacial Age, and the Epoch of the Mammoth. They have been em-

ployed by others to prove a great antiquity for man on the earth. Dr. Southall seems to demonstrate the recent date of the Glacial Age, and also to prove the comparatively recent existence of the mammoth. His facts and arguments certainly go far towards overthrowing the opposite views. No one can read the volume without feeling that he is following a patient and candid guide, and who would not willingly lead him into error. The closing chapter, on the "Antiquity of Man in America," will be of special interest to American readers. The volume does honor to the distinguished author, and will doubtless aid the cause of scientific truth. It will at the same time tend to confirm our faith in the teaching of the Bible. There is no place in this volume for the modern theory of evolution, or the existence of man for countless ages on this earth.

It is due to the publishers to say that the volume is brought out in excellent style. The illustrations are well executed, and the whole mechanical part of the work substantial and attractive.

Foreign Classics for English Readers, Edited by Mrs. Oliphant. *Pascal*, by Principal Tulloch. pp. 205.

Few authors have received higher or more undisputed praise than Pascal. He has an unquestioned right to the very highest honors as a profound thinker and polished writer. But it may well be doubted whether he is read in any proportion to the praise bestowed on him. Many are content to express their admiration without knowing why, or with scarcely having read enough of him to form an opinion. One reason for this is the profound character of much of his thinking; and another may be the want of popular accessible editions of his works. The design of this little volume is to introduce, or—if he does not need introduction—to make the mass of English readers better acquainted with Pascal. It gives, although not very full, an interesting sketch of his life, accompanied with extracts from his various writings. These extracts will serve to show the cast of his mind and the character of his compositions. The volume belongs to the series of "Foreign Classics for English Readers," and is in every way attractive. In an age not specially distinguished for profound sober thought on moral and religious questions, this publication will aid in directing attention to the loftiest and most important themes.

SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO., NEW YORK.
(Through J. B. Lippincott & Co.)

The Natural History of Atheism, by John Stuart Blackie, Professor of Greek at the University of Edinburgh. pp. 253. 1878.

Almost anything from the pen of Professor Blackie is sure to attract attention, at least in certain quarters, and to secure readers. His poetic temperament and classic learning, with a wealth of imag-

ery and expression, make him a favorite author with those who can appreciate the charm of such a writer. A new volume from him is hailed with pleasing anticipations. But those who expect, from the title of this volume, a theological, or philosophical, or critical, or historical treatment of Atheism, will experience a measure of disappointment. The volume certainly has some good things in it, but it does not rise to "the height of this great argument," or handle such a theme as it deserves. Indeed, we think, that the author can hardly be said to have seriously grappled with his subject at all. He has satisfied himself with skirmishing with this dread, black foe of God and mand.

The volume contains six chapters on the subjects of: PRESUMPTIONS; THEISM, ITS REASONABLE GROUND; ATHEISM, ITS VARIETIES AND COMMON ROOT; POLYTHEISM; BUDDHISM; THE ATHEISM OF REACTION; MODERN ENGLISH ATHEISTS AND AGNOSTICS; MARTINEAU AND TYNDALL. Atheism is defined as "a disease of the speculative faculty which must be expected to reappear from time to time, when men are shaken out of the firm forms of their old beliefs, and have not yet had time to work themselves into the well-defined mould of a new one." We are satisfied, with Professor Blackie and Plato, to consider Atheism a disease, but we are not sure that its seat is in the speculative faculty. In the second and third chapters, which treat more specifically of THEISM and ATHEISM, the author utters some bold truths in regard to Atheism. He has very little respect for the pretensions of Atheism, and holds it in deserved abhorrence; yet is hardly consistent with his own definition in viewing it in its different phases "as proceeding from the want of a root of reverence in the soul." This is not so much speculative as moral and practical.

The chapters on POLYTHEISM and BUDDHISM are more extended, embracing nearly half of the entire volume, and contain very interesting discussions and criticisms. Those who have never looked at Buddhism will probably be surprised at his statements and applications.

There is a good deal in the last chapter, on THE ATHEISM OF REACTION, against which we must enter a strong demurrer. What, for instance, will sober critics say of a Greek professor uttering the following? "It does not require any very profound scholarship to know that the word ἀΐδιος, which we translate EVERLASTING, does not signify eternity absolutely and metaphysically: but only popularly, as when we say that a man is an eternal fool, meaning only that he is a very great fool!!! For the reputation of Professor Blackie we could wish he had never uttered this, or could blot it out. Place along side of it the profound and scholarly discussion of such terms by Tayler Lewis, who knew quite as much of Greek as Professor Blackie, and we are impressed with the thoughtful, reverent scholar, as compared with this flippant Grecian of Edinburgh. Canon Farrar will take

courage at such utterances, but it may well be doubted whether they do not tend to irreligion and Atheism.

His charge against "a class of Christian ministers in the Scottish Highlands specially amongst the clerygy of the Free Church," who are opposed to "dancing, and singing, and cards and theatres," as if they were by the power of REACTION producing Atheism, will hardly more commend itself to serious and thoughtful minds. There may sometimes be an excess of rigor inculcated, and as a question of expediency we are willing that Professor Blackie shall hold his own views on such subjects. But to insinuate that the ministers of a Church that boasts a Chalmers, a Guthrie, and an Arnot, all of whom preached against worldly dissipations, is a school to train for Atheism, is simply to betray the prejudice and bigotry of the author in spite of liberal pretensions. It is the old MODERATISM of Scotland and England showing its contempt for a more earnest piety. Sidney Smith called forth the withering invectives of Dr. Chalmers by sneering at the same school of religion. There is much greater danger of fiddling, dancing, whiskey-drinking ministers and elders, or such an one as Professor Blackie says, "it is contrary to his nature not to like a good dinner and to shrink from a glass of good wine"—causing unbelief and Atheism, than that too rigid a piety should. Love for a "glass of good wine," or even bad whiskey, needs no special encouragement in Scotland.

We have been interested in this volume, the subject and the treatment, but scarcely know whether it has most to commend or to censure. There is danger that the loose and scarcely reverent expressions in it will do more harm than the other parts will do good. No doubt Professor Blackie would class us among the "cataphract theologic" ones who are helping the cause of Atheism by such strictness. Very well, he has had his say, and now we have ours, and we say that he has uttered not a little in this volume that does no credit to himself as a scholar or a professed believer, and that will do no good to the cause he is aiming to serve.

A serious defect in this volume, of a different character, is the want of a good Index. Such a work especially needs one.

Life and Times of Thomas Becket, by James Anthony Froude, M. A., pp. 150. 1878.

In this volume the author has given us a very life-like picture of the life and times of Becket. The subject is evidently to his taste, and he tells his story with dramatic affect. We see this bold, obstinate high churchman, Arch-bishop of Canterbury, moving on the stage until his tragic death, and the curtain falls. In painting the corruptions of the church, and the ecclesiastical arrogance of Becket, the historian has failed to give a like coloring to the corruption and

misrule in civil affairs. One is tempted to ask, was the fault all on the side of the Church, or was not much due to the general corruption and degeneracy of the times? It is certainly a dark picture that is here drawn, and it may teach a lesson to those who are continually croaking about the Church and the world growing worse and worse.

It is hardly necessary to commend this volume to those who desire a view of Becket and his times. Any who begin to read it will not care to lay it down until it is finished.

All Saints' Day and Other Sermons, by the Rev. Charles Kingsley, M. A., Late Rector of Eversley and Canon of Westminster. Edited by the Rev. W. Harrison, M. A., Rector of Brington. pp. x., 410. 1878.

But few of these sermons were prepared with any idea of their being printed. "They were written out very roughly"—we are told—"sometimes at an hour's notice, as occasion demanded, and were only intended for delivery from the Pulpit." They are hardly fair subjects for criticism on the score of homiletical or literary merit. They certainly cannot rank very high as models of sermons. But they may serve better than his more elaborate discourses to give us an idea of the man and the preacher. They are good specimens of plain, simple, direct address to hearers, and reveal some of the elements of Kingsley's popularity. He had a warm, sympathizing heart, and he carried this into his sermons. There are some lessons to be learned from a reading of this volume, that stilted preachers would do well to study. Their simplicity and directness of address are refreshing.

Epochs of Modern History. The Beginning of the Middle Ages. By R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's; Honorary Fellow of Oriel. With three Maps. pp. 226.

This is another, and we believe the eleventh, volume of this admirable series of "Epochs of Modern History." But whilst thus far along in the list, we are told that "it must be considered as an introduction or preface to the series." The Introduction treats of the division between ancient and modern history, with a few leading events until the division of the Roman Empire into Eastern and Western, and the invasion of the barbarians. Thence we are carried along till the beginning of the eleventh century. The narrative is necessarily concise, but it will serve to fix in the mind leading events and prepare for a more minute study of these centuries. This volume is unlike the others of the series in this, that whilst they treat of a particular epoch, this one furnishes an outline of many centuries. Three good maps, marking successive periods in the history, a chronological table of ten

pages, and a full Index, add greatly to the value of the work. This series must make the study of history to the young easy and attractive.

HARPER & BROS., NEW YORK.

Cyprus: Its Ancient Cities, Tombs, and Temples. A narrative of researches and excavations during ten years' residence in that Island. By General Louis Palma Di Cesnola, Mem. of the Royal Academy of Sciences, Turin, Hon. Mem. of the Royal Society of Literature, London, etc. With Maps and Illustrations. pp. xix., 456. 1878.

This is a volume of rare interest and value. There is everything about it to invest it with peculiar attractions. The island of Cyprus, from its very position, has been an object of interest from comparatively early times; and although its very earliest history is obscure, it figures conspicuously in the Grecian wars, and from that time onward. It was deemed of sufficient importance to claim the attention and labors of the first missionaries of Christianity. The Introduction to the volume, covering forty pages, gives an epitome of the history of Cyprus from the earliest times to its subjugation, and incorporation in the Turkish Empire in the sixteenth century. That history is one of almost constant disquietude, with successive revolutions, and disaster following disaster.

General Louis Palma Di Cesnola was appointed Consul at Cyprus by President Lincoln, a few days before his death, and reached his post on Christmas day of that year. How much time he devoted to his Consulship we cannot say, but he certainly employed his leisure well in exploring the island, and has obtained results that will render his name famous in all time, and afford pleasure and instruction to all who are privileged to read his book, or examine his wonderful collection. For ten years General Di Cesnola continued his researches, and this volume contains the account of his marvellous discoveries, with ample illustrations of their character. He prosecuted his labors amid manifold and continued difficulties, interposed by Turkish officials and the worthless character of those whose services he was compelled to use. But in spite of all difficulties, the success was great, and the results must be viewed with admiration. He succeeded in opening ten thousand tombs, and bringing to light their long buried treasures. The number and variety of sculptures, of vases of various descriptions, of personal ornaments, of works of art of all kinds, are truly wonderful. A description of them would be to repeat the contents of this volume, for it is crowded with the simple narrative of these researches and illustrations of the discoveries made. Whilst all are interesting, some are worthy of special note. At Lanarca, among many others, he found a colossal statue of Hercules, eight feet nine inches in height, a photograph of which adorns page 133 of the volume. The

opposite page is adorned with what is supposed to be a statue of a Priest of Venus, only a little less in size. The remains discovered here seem to represent different nations, and among them is an Assyrian statue of life size, and which he succeeded in securing, he tells us, "unmarred even by a scratch." The details of the unearthing and cleaning up of this statue is quite entertaining. It now adorns page 143 of the volume, and the author says: "Of all the statues I discovered, none were so purely Assyrian in character as this." Here we learn that, 'after eleven days of continuous labor with 110 men on a line of sixty feet they had advanced only nine feet toward the centre, yet 228 sculptures had been unearthed.'

At other places corresponding success crowned his labors. The richest variety of treasures rewarded his efforts at Curium. Some fifty pages are crowded with the remains of art, and buried treasures found here. In an Appendix, prepared by Mr. C. W. King, A. M., of Trinity College, Cambridge, we are furnished with a catalogue of the engraved gems found in the treasure vaults of the temple at Curium. We have also in the Appendix a description of the different types of vases found in Cyprus, the inscriptions in different languages, and other valuable information.

No pains or cost seem to have been spared in the publication of this volume. Even the outside displays its character. Without and within it is full of the representations of ancient art and life in Cyprus. The history of bygone centuries is set before us so that we can almost see the living figures. The volume is no dry discussions of theories, or philosophical speculations about the civilization of those times, but an array of discoveries and facts from which we may judge for ourselves. It is eminently a narrative of facts and an exhibition of positive results achieved. These must speak for themselves, and they tell their own story. There is a commendable freedom on the part of the author from extravagant boasting of what he was permitted to see and accomplish. The whole story is told in a very simple, artless, straightforward way, with just enough of personal experience and adventure to impart to it a life-like freshness. It is not a volume to weary one in reading. There is nothing tedious or heavy about it. It is full of interest, full of instruction, and cannot fail to be appreciated.

We have aimed to give a general idea of the volume, and not to attempt a minute criticism of any particular part. It is assumed that everything in the volume is entirely trust-worthy. Its general spirit awakens no suspicion of any attempt to impose on the reader. It has an air of candor and truthfulness that cannot be mistaken, and one feels that he is not reading dreamy speculations. The author has doubtless achieved a success in this volume as well as in his explorations, and the publishers have added their judgment and skill in furnishing a proper casket to hold and convey the rich treasure.

Popular Astronomy. By Simon Newcomb, LL. D., Professor U. S. Naval Observatory. With one Hundred and Twelve Engravings, and five Maps of the Stars. pp. xvi., 566. 1878.

Astronomy may be fitly called the "queen of sciences:" it is probably the oldest, as it is undoubtedly the most attractive and the grandest. In all ages, and among nearly all peoples, the character and movements of the heavenly bodies have claimed admiring if not devout attention. It has been felt and freely expressed that the study of Astronomy is elevating and ennobling, eminently adapted to fill the mind with sublime conceptions, and lead the soul to Him who sits enthroned above the heavens.

The progress of this science marks some of the grandest achievements in modern discoveries. The extent and accuracy of the knowledge now possessed of the heavenly bodies, with the laws governing their movements, compared with that possessed by the ancients, is truly wonderful. And yet the field is continually widening, and opening up new wonders to the diligent explorer.

This volume, by Prof. S. Newcomb, illustrates fully what has just been said, and fills a very important place among the vast number of publications on this general subject. The author is well known as one of the devoted students of this Science, and who is contributing his share in different ways to advance its interests. This work will supply just what many intelligent readers desire and need. Most of the works written on Astronomy are so elementary, and often so inaccurate and unsatisfactory, that they serve but little purpose towards even a moderate knowledge of the subject. Others are so learned, and purely scientific, as to be out of the reach of all except the learned few. But this work combines accuracy and genuine scientific knowledge, with such simplicity and popular method of treatment, as will make it acceptable to vast numbers of readers of average scholarship. We cannot do better than to allow the author himself to explain the general drift of his work. "Its main object," he says, "is to present the general reading public with a condensed view of the history, methods, and results of astronomical research, especially in those fields which are of most popular and philosophical interest at the present day, couched in such language as to be intelligible without mathematical study. He hopes that the earlier chapters will, for the most part, be readily understood by any one having clear geometrical ideas, and that the later ones will be intelligible to all." In the prosecution of his plan, "the historic and philosophic sides of the subject have been treated with greater fulness than is usual in works of this character, while the purely technical side has been proportionately condensed."

The work is divided into four parts, which treat consecutively of, THE SYSTEM OF THE WORLD HISTORICALLY DEVELOPED; PRACTI-

CAL ASTRONOMY; THE SOLAR SYSTEM; and, THE STELLAR UNIVERSE, to which is added an extended Appendix embracing a large amount of special information on a variety of topics connected with the general subject. There is, as there should be to all works of any importance, an Index, followed by an Addendum on THE SATELLITES OF MARS and EXPLANATION OF THE STAR MAPS, of which latter there are five. There are also one hundred and twelve illustrations scattered through the volume.

This work, as may be gathered from what has been thus briefly said, has been prepared with evident care, and is a most valuable addition to this department of literature and study. We know of no volume of the kind at all equal to it. Others may be more strictly scientific, or treat a single topic with more fulness, but this gives a comprehensive view of the whole field, and mingles the latest scientific methods and results with popularity of treatment.

Too much can hardly be said of the style in which the work is issued. The very numerous illustrations are not put in to swell the volume, but to answer a real purpose, and they are executed in a manner that is at once attractive and instructive. The stellar maps at the end of the volume are beautiful in their kind. The whole execution is worthy of the subject and its scholarly treatment by Prof. Newcomb. If any who buy this volume are not pleased and instructed, we are sure the fault cannot be with the author or the publishers. They have done their part, and have done it admirably.

The Khedive's Egypt or the Old House of Bondage under New Masters. By Edwin De Leon, Ex-Agent and Consul-general in Egypt. With Illustrations. pp. xii., 435. 1878.

The author asks, in a Preface, "What can any body have to tell us about the Nile-land that has not already been said or sung?" If he has not told us any thing very new, he has managed to give us a very fresh and interesting volume on an old subject. It would be commonplace for us to dwell upon Egypt—to speak of its hoary antiquity, its stupendous pyramids, its wonderful productiveness, the fame of schools and philosophy two thousand years ago. These and many other things, are they not all written in the books, and read by all?

The aim of our author is to give us a view of Egypt as it now is, and as he has had the opportunity of observing for himself, during a residence of many years in an official capacity, and which he left only last April, or less than a year ago. It cannot be questioned that he has enjoyed advantages far beyond travelers, who spend only a few days and then tell us the wonderful things they have seen, the most of which they have seen only in books. Mr. De Leon has seen Egypt, and had an opportunity for studying the subject of which he writes.

He takes us from Southampton, via Gibraltar, Malta, and the Suez

Canal, till he lands us in Cairo. We are then fairly introduced to Egypt, and through successive chapters are led to examine the various aspects of the country and government, founders of the dynasty, the successive rulers and changes effected, the present Khedive and changes now going on, the productions and tillage of the country, education, judicial tribunals, finances and resources, social life, and progress, etc., etc. This is a very meagre and imperfect outline, and suggests but a few of the many subjects touched upon in the volume. There is a number of appendices giving statistical and other information on topics touched upon in the volume. There are also seven illustrations. We cannot say much for these illustrations. They may serve a purpose, but are not in the highest style of the art. We miss anything in the way of an Index. The volume, while respectable in its style of publication, is hardly up to the average standard of the celebrated publishing establishment that issues it. As the author gives his PREFACE in the shape of an APOLOGY, perhaps he and his publishers do not anticipate any very permanent reputation for the volume. And in the constant changes going on it may be that some one else will soon be needed to tell the story of Egypt's ever changing condition. Still Mr. De Leon has done service for the present time, and his book will give a better view of Egypt as it is, than many other works more learned and more pretentious. Designed to be popular in its treatment, it will be read with pleasure and instruction.

History of the English People by John Richard Green, M. A., vol. I. Early England, 449—1071: England Under Foreign Kings 1071—1214: The Charter 1204—1291: The Parliament 1307—1461, with Eight Maps. pp. xi., 575. 1878.

The publication by Mr. Green, a few years ago, of his "Short History of the English People," was a remarkable success. It was at once hailed as the most readable, and for the character and design of the work, the most satisfactory in the language. The very general favor with which it was received by learned critics as well as by common readers, has led the author to give it a careful revision, and to publish it in a form still more acceptable for permanent use. Much in the present work is simply what was in the former one, but there are numerous changes and important additions. The authorities are more fully given. Some statements amplified, here and there new matter introduced, and the whole subjected to a revision. This first volume of the American Edition embraces nearly 600 pages, and brings the history down to the middle of the fifteenth century. Whilst the same general order and method of treatment, as in the former work, are observed, it is separated into distinct Books and Chapters, more clearly distinguishing the different parts and marking more distinctly the progress of the narrative. The number of maps is increased and

their character improved. The reader will at once be struck with the more attractive apprearance of this work. The other was crowded, a model of compactness in printing—a great work of more than 800 pages pressed into one compact volume of moderate size and small cost: this one is a model of clear, open, attractive looking pages, adding much to the pleasure in reading it. This promises to be the standard history of the English People, and it is well that it is published in so attractive a style. For a general history it will take its place in well selected libraries, and will be read and consulted as an authority. We hail with pleasure this valuable work in its revised form and new dress. It is one of the most important additions to our historical literature.

Daniel, The Beloved, by the Rev. W. M. Taylor, D. D., Minister of The Broadway Tabernacle, New York City; author of "Peter the Apostle," "David, King of Israel," "Elijah the Prophet," etc. pp. 245. 1878.

Dr. Taylor is quite well known by his former volumes on some of the leading characters in the Bible. He is turning to good account his studies for the pulpit, and thus securing a larger audience by means of the press. This volume is marked by the same general characteristics as the preceding ones. The author is a reverent student of the Bible, a vigorous writer, and earnest in his presentation of religious truth. He evinces a large share of good, practical, common sense, and looks at religion as a matter that concerns our daily life. The lessons of the Bible are brought to bear on our true way of living.

This volume embraces thirteen discourses on leading topics in the book of Daniel, the first being, "Daniel at College," and the last, "The Character of Daniel." He shows a proper regard for his readers by supplying the volume, though it has a Table of Contents, with an Index. The discourses will be found stimulating and edifying. It were well if more of our preachers, like Dr. Taylor, would carefully study the Bible, with a view of giving the rich results of such study in earnest and substantial discourses to their hearers.

Our Children's Songs. With Illustrations. pp. 207. 1878.

This is a charming volume, for children shall we say? no, for all, and especially for the old folks to read to children. It is by far the fullest and best collection that we know of in this line of poetry. It is a real treasury of "Children's Songs." There are many that we have all heard in our childhood, and some of which perhaps few have heard—gathered from fields but little known. It would be silly to criticise this volume on its poetic merits alone or chiefly, although it contains many a gem. It would be as silly to criticise the prattle of infancy by Aristotle's rules, or children's play houses by the plan of

Diana's temple, as to criticise this volume as one would Milton or Tennyson. It is a volume to be read, and sung, and laughed over with children and enjoyed in the home circle—to awaken memories of the past, pleasing associations of the present, and to mellow the autumn of old age. It has something for childhood of every period, even for "the child an hundred years old."

It is arranged into "Songs for the Nursery; Songs for Childhood; Songs for Girlhood; Songs for Boyhood;—Our Children's Sacred Songs. Part I. Hymns for the Nursery; Part II. Hymns for Childhood." About seventy of the poems are illustrated, and there is a complete Index of first lines. Our poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, contributes an "Introductory Song," and we presume we are indebted to him for the taste and skill in the collection. We recommend this volume as one that cannot fail to afford pleasure in the family, and prove a rich source of both enjoyment and improvement. It will help to sweeten home, and bind the sweet influences of childhood around our hearts. A stanza from the "Introductory Song" will serve to illustrate the subject and commend the volume.

"Ah! what would the world be to us
If the children were no more?
We should dread the desert behind us,
Worse than the dark before."

LEE & SHEPARD, BOSTON.
(Through J. B. Lippincott & Co.)

Lost Forever. By L. T. Townsend, D. D., author of "Credo," "Sword and Garment," "God-Man," "Outlines of Theology," "Arena and Throne," etc. pp. 448.

The various able and well-known volumes which the public have received from the pen of Dr. Townsend, are a recommendation for any new work appearing with his name. They all bear the impress of a vigorous mind and trustworthy scholarship. This volume on Future Punishment is timely, and will be found to furnish a very valuable discussion to those who desire to read upon the subject. The contents are ranged in nine chapters, under the heads: Aversion; Bases; Disclosure; God-Nature; Human Nature; Administration; Judgment; Hell—its king and subjects; Duration; with an Appendix on Universalist Standard Works and Principal Scripture Texts; Orthodox Works on Endless Punishment; Punishment as Related to the Universal Good, and Exposure of the Sins of the Righteous on the Day of Judgment.

The chapter on the Duration of Punishment reviews the several forms of Universalistic teaching, and shows their unsoundness, from the Holy Scriptures and recognized ethical principles. There are a few statements in the work which we cannot accept; but we desire to

commend it as a vigorous presentation of the general orthodox belief of the Church on the subject. It is a book of the kind now needed.

The Supernatural Factor in Religious Revivals. By L. T. Townsend, D. D., author of "Credo," etc. pp. 311. 1877.

Dr. Townsend has here given us another interesting book. The object of the work is to present, as impartially as possible, the various facts relating to revivals, to show, in philosophical method, the more obvious proper deductions, and to test the modern revival and religious methods. It is divided into five parts. 1. Facts of Human Nature and Human Appliances. 2. Deductions from a Survey of Religious Revivals. 3. Deductions from individual Religious Experience. 4. Evangelists and Revival Agencies, and 5, The Boston Tabernacle. The supernatural element in these special awakenings is clearly traced.

The author writes in warm sympathy with revivals, and approves of well-directed and earnest effort made to promote them. He approves, too, of the method of evangelistic work, so prominently represented in these late days in the labors of Moody and Sankey. Radical ground is taken in favor of the admission of women to "the platform and the pulpit." Dr. Townsend, however, sees and warns against the abuses and perversions of the revival system. Various questions are raised, in the course of this discussion, on which a wide difference of view is found among Christian ministers, and many who agree with him in the fundamental fact of a supernatural factor in revivals, will have to dissent entirely from some views of them here presented.

The Historical Student's Manual, by Alfred Waters. Octavo. pp. 7.

This is a most excellent manual for the reader of modern history to keep open for use on his table. It is meant to show, at a glance, the duration of the reign of all the ENGLISH monarchs, and that of their contemporaries of FRANCE, GERMANY, and of the PAPACY, from the invasion of William "the Conqueror" to the present time. CELEBRATED EVENTS of each period are given in place, printed in red ink for convenience of the eye. The use of this inexpensive chart will greatly aid the student in the related chronology of the various historical periods and events.

The Telephone: an Account of the Phenomena of Electricity, Magnetism, and Sound, as involved in its Action. With Directions for Making a Speaking Telephone. By Prof. A. E. Dolbear, Tufts College, author of "The Art of Projecting," etc. pp. 128. 1877.

Great interest has been awakened by the wonders of the Telephone, and this small book explanatory of its structure and the scientific principles involved, will meet a general want. As was necessary to enable the reader to understand the instrument, the author has given

a brief, but satisfactory account of the phenomena of electricity, magnetism, and sound. By help of cuts he explains the inter-action of these several factors, and the methods of their application in the structure of the Telephone. Different Telephones are figured and explained, with a full description of and directions for making the Speaking Telephone of which Prof. Dolbear is himself the inventor.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., CHICAGO.

Between the Gates. By Benj. F. Taylor, author of "Songs of Yesterday," "Old-Time Pictures," "World on Wheels," "Camp and Field," etc. With Illustrations. pp. 292. 1878.

These sketches of a trip to California are almost indescribable. They are graphic and racy. They are sunny, eccentric, brilliant, full of commingled beauty and grotesque humor. The poem which forms the preface, "The Overland Train," exhibits the imagination and power of a true poet. The various chapters, on almost all points of California scenery and life, are very entertaining, throwing out many practical truths in rare and humorous representations. There is, we think, an excess of effort on the writer's part to use old and extravagant similes. It sometimes sacrifices literary excellence for the sake of what is simply comical.

D. APPLETON & CO., NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

The Ancient Life-History of the Earth. A Comprehensive Outline of the Principles and Leading Facts of Palæontological Science. By H. Alleyne Nicholson, M. D., D. Sc., M. A., Ph. D., (Gött), F. R. S. E., F. L. S., Professor of Natural History in the University of St. Andrews. pp. 407. 1878.

Prof. Nicholson is an acknowledged authority in the department in which he writes. A work from his pen, presenting the facts of Palaeontological Science in its present stage of progress, must at once take its place as a recognized standard in this study. The design and scope of the work is best indicated from the Preface: "In a former work, the Author has endeavored to furnish a summary of the more important facts of Palaeontology, regarded strictly in its scientific aspect as a mere department of the great science of Biology. The present work on the other hand, is to attempt to treat Palaeontology more especially from its historical side, and its more intimate relation to Geology. In accordance with this object, the introductory portion of the work is devoted to a consideration of the general principles of Palaeontology, and the bearing of this science upon various geological problems. * * * The second portion deals exclusively with Historical Palaeontology, each formation being considered sep-

arately, as regards its lithological nature and subdivisions, its relations to other formations, its geographical distribution, its mode of origin, and its characteristic life-forms."

Upon the point in controversy between the geological theories of Catastrophism and Continuity, Prof. Nicholson believes "the balance of evidence decisively in favor of some theory of CONTINUITY." In this he differs somewhat from Prof. De Conte and Mr. Clarence King, who recognize catastrophistic action more prominently, on the ground of evidences furnished especially in the more recent investigations of American Geology. On the related point of "Evolution," the author holds that "the evidence of Palaeontology is in favor of the view that the succession of life-forms upon the globe has been to a large extent regulated by some orderly and constantly-acting law of modification and evolution. * * * On the other hand, there are facts which point clearly to the existence of some law other than that of evolution, and probably of a deeper and more far-reaching character. Upon no theory of Evolution can we find a satisfactory explanation of the constant introduction throughout geological time of new forms of life, which do not appear to have been preceded by pre-existent allied types."

The work breathes the true scientific spirit—calm and reverent—and must be classed with the important and most valuable of recent scientific publications.

W. J. MIDDLETON, NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

Democracy in Europe: A History. By Sir Thomas Erskine May, K. C. B., D. C. L., author of "The Constitutional History of England since the Accession of George III., 1760—1871." In Two Volumes. pp. 495 and 552. 1878.

Few subjects present a study of greater importance and more abiding interest than the progress of liberty and free government. It is full of great questions, in which men generally are deeply and increasingly concerned. Upon these questions the two fine volumes that form the work before us are meant to throw light. The work will be found to be one of the most valuable additions that have, for some years, been made to the literature of this great subject. The author possesses peculiar qualifications for a task of the kind here executed. He has long and carefully studied the principles and mechanism of popular government. His "Parliamentary Laws and Practice," a standard of English usage, and his "Constitutional History of England," have secured him a recognized position among able writers. He has lived through a period remarkable for the progress of democratic ideas. He has been constantly and closely connected with public affairs, mostly in the House of Commons, where he has sat

carefully observing this progress, like Canute watching the rising tide. Few men could be better prepared to discuss European democracy.

Sir Erskine May has used the term 'Democracy' in this work, not in the strict signification of the sovereignty of the whole people, but in a more comprehensive sense, as embracing every degree of popular power or political liberty, whether in a constitutional monarchy or in a republic. In treating the subject, he has adopted the only method at all likely to yield satisfactory results. Eschewing theories, he examines the subject in the illumination of historical facts—tracing the teaching that is to be read in the actual experiences through which the advance of political freedom has taken place. He has presented the principles of liberty and popular government in their historic forms and practical working, rather than in abstract statements and elaborate discussions.

The work opens with an extended introductory discussion, pointing out the various influences that promote or hinder freedom and popular government, the relations of moral, social and physical conditions, the bearing of climates, and geographical peculiarities, of religions and commerce, of race and education. The first chapter presents the general contrast between the Eastern and Western civilizations and the remarkable absence of free government from the countries of Asia, except in the theocratic federal republic founded by the Jews. The second and third chapters trace the history and discuss the principles of liberty and democratic institutions in Greece. Two chapters are devoted to the fortunes of republican or popular government among the Romans. The sixth chapter is occupied with the Dark Ages and the Revival, bringing us to the great quickening of free thought and popular power through the Reformation. The seventh chapter discusses the Italian Republics. The remaining two, of the first volume, sketch the political history of liberty-loving Switzerland. The second volume brings the Netherlands, France, and England under extended and elaborate reviews.

This outline is sufficient to indicate the compass and value of the work. The author writes from the standpoint of ardent admiration for the English Constitution, which seems to be about his ideal of a justly balanced free government. He shows the glow of an earnest interest in the great subject. His style is admirable—vigorous, fresh, and transparent. While, on various questions that crowd his pages, there are some views open to objection, the work is marked by a most discriminating and sound judgment. We think he has failed to represent justly, however, the influence of Christianity on the development of free institutions in the later centuries of the Middle Ages. Corrupt as the Church was, and identified with despotisms, there yet, probably, came out of the great doctrines she taught and the life she quickened more influence FOR freedom than her special adverse teach-

ings and repressions exerted AGAINST it. We are surprised to find reference made to so worthless an authority as Draper's "Conflict between Religion and Science." But the faults of the work, we believe, are few and small, and its excellences varied and great. His plan, restricting his inquiry to European nations, has not included the instructive lessons to be learned from the action of democratic principles in our own country; but from his chosen field of the old world, he has brought together, in admirable order, rich material for the comparative study of the principles of free government and human progress.

On the Study of Words. Lectures addressed (originally) to the Pupils at the Diocesan Training-School, Winchester, by Richard Chenevix Trench, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. From the latest revised English Edition. With an Exhaustive Analysis, Additional Words for illustration, and Questions for Examination. By Thomas D. Supplée, Head Master of St. Augustines College, Benecia, California. pp. 395. 1878.

Dean Trench's book "On the Study of Words" has been too long and favorably known to the public to need either description or endorsement. Prof. Supplée has here adapted it most admirably for use in the school-room as a text-book. He has added a complete and exhaustive analysis of the revised text, a set of questions designed to call out the facts in the discussions, and also, at the end of each lecture, a list of other words to encourage original study on the part of the pupil. The new arrangement and additions cannot fail to be of great assistance both to the teacher and the student.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK.

A History of Latin Literature. By Leonard Schmitz, LL. D., Classical Examiner in the University of London. pp. 262.

This small volume meets a felt want in the schools and colleges of the country. Dr. Schmitz has justly thought it strange that there should not exist in our language "a concise general history of Latin Literature that might be put into the hands of young students, and give them a succinct history of its treasures, of its gradual development and ultimate decay." He supplies the need, and supplies it well, in this little work. He has not confined himself to those parts of Latin Literature which are still extant, or even to those writers deservedly held to be classical and read in schools and universities, but has given a complete, though brief, survey of the whole domain of literature, from its rudest beginnings down to the time when the Latin language lost its original character, as a spoken tongue, in the modern languages of Italy, France, and Spain. No kind of literary production has been excluded — even grammars, school-books and technical works. The specific Christian writers of the early cen-

turies are included. The writers, with their works, are arranged in periods, after the general plan of W. S. Teuffel's "Geschichte der Römischen Literatur." A feature of value is the naming of one or two good editions of every author, in foot-notes. The work will form an admirable manual for students in Academies and Colleges, and a book of convenient reference in libraries generally.

JAMES R. OSGOOD & CO., BOSTON.

Boston Monday Lectures. Orthodoxy, with Preludes on Current Events. By Joseph Cook. pp. 343. 1878.

This is the THIRD VOLUME of these now famous lectures. In the January number of the REVIEW we expressed our judgment of the merits of the two volumes on Biology and Transcendentalism; and we find no occasion in this volume to alter the general judgment there expressed. The present volume is rather a continuation of the subjects begun in the previous one, and is marked by the same peculiarities of thought and style. It would be as ridiculous to decry Mr. Cook's talents and attainments, as it would be to set him up as a model of careful, profound investigation, or of correct and chaste composition. The fact is Mr. Cook presents a great many important truths, and has a way of putting them that is often very striking. At the same time he is frequently very extravagant in his expressions, and gives utterance to much that, when read coolly and pondered, cannot commend itself to one's sober judgment. The lectures will doubtless do good, but more as popular lectures than as profound discussions of momentous themes. As this volume has taken the name of ORTHODOXY—on what ground we hardly know—we feel disposed to repeat our unwillingness to be judged by such a standard. It seems to us that Mr. Cook has ventured on some church questions, as well as on some intricate points in theology, that he would better leave to more experienced hands. In such a fight with rationalism and infidelity it is not wise to assume doubtful positions, or positions of antagonism to old and cherished views. Mr. Cook has an undoubted right to combat error wherever he may find it, and, as he professes to know nothing but the truth, to be very bold in his assertions. Still it may be that some other men who have studied the same subjects have opinions as worthy of consideration as his, and it were well not to be too dogmatic. We commend the volumes for the amount of truth they contain, but ask that what we understand by ORTHODOXY be not held responsible for all Mr. Cook's utterances.

Iowa und Missouri. Eine Vertheidegung der Lehrstelling der Synode von Iowa gegenüber den Angriffen des Herrn Prof. Schmidt. Von Sigmund und Gottfried Fritschel, Professor am theol. Seminar Wartburg zu Mendota, Ill. pp. 221. 1878.

This is a vindication of Iowa against the attacks of Missouri, and

illustrates how professedly strict Lutherans agree. We may recur to the subject and this publication in another number.

Memorabilia concerning the Rev. Lucas Rauss, one of the Early Ministers of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America: including an account of his Ancestors and Descendants. By the Rev. Luther A Gotwald, D. D., Pastor of St. Paul's Evangelical Luthern Church of York, Penn'a. O. Stuck printer, York, Pa. pp. 68. 1878.

This is a valuable contribution, not only as a memoir, but to the early history of the Lutheran Church in this country. Such memorabilia of all our earlier ministers would help greatly to furnish and preserve a knowledge of the planting of the Lutheran Church in America. Dr. Gotwald has performed a service that will be appreciated not only by the descendants of Rev. Lucas Rauss, but by the Church at large.

Localities of the Reformation. by G. D. Bernheim, D. D. Wilmington, N. C. A Lecture. pp. 23. 1877.

This Lecture furnishes very interesting notices of some of the prominent localities in the life of Luther as seen by the author. Of course a single lecture can present only a small part of all that might be said.

PERIODICALS.

The *North American Review* for nearly two-thirds of a century has been the acknowledged leader among the Reviews in the United States. The numbers 260, 261 of this year bespeak its venerable age, but it gives evidence of renewing its youth. Long the pride of Boston, and of New England culture, it has changed the locality of its publication, and now hails from New York—D. Appleton & Co. publishers. The fact that the first two numbers, now a bi-monthly, have reached a second edition, shows its renewed popularity. Under the new regime it must hold the leading place which it so long occupied. The articles in the January–February, and March–April numbers are by distinguished writers and embrace a wide range of subjects. Among the noticeable articles are Charles Sumner, by Senator Hoar, General Amnesty, by J. Randolph Tucker, Ephesus, Cyprus and Mycenæ, by Bayard Taylor, Capture of Kars, and Fall of Plevna, by General G. B. McClellan, English and American Universities compared, by Chas. W. Eliot, LL. D., Stone Wall Jackson and the Valley Campaign, by Gen. Richard Taylor, The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment, by six divines of different Churches and views. Contemporary literature is duly noticed. It is published at $5.00 a year, or $1.00 a single number.

The *Foreign Quarterlies* and *Blackwood*, *Harper*, and *Littell*. continue to come freighted with their rich and varied contents.

CONTENTS OF NO. II.

Article. Page.

I. A Question Touching the Augsburg Confession, 161

II. Neurology and the Human Soul,..... 177
By Prof. W. H. Wynn, Ph. D., State Agricultural College, Ames, Ia.

III. A Study of Francis Xavier,..... 199
By Rev. Prof. W. E. Parson, A. M., of the Imperial University of Tokio, Japan.

IV. Guarantees to Faith,..... 218
By Prof. S. A. Repass, D. D., Salem, Va.

V. What is the Duty of the Church toward her Delinquent Members,..... 229
Rev. A. W. Lilly, A. M., York, Pa.

VI. Adam,..... 244
* Translated from the German of Dean Buchrucker, of Munich, by Rev. G. F. Behringer, Indianapolis, Ind.

VII. The Scribes Before and in the Time of Christ, 249
By Rev. B. Pick, Rochester, N. Y.

VIII. The Higher Education Without God,..... 278
By C. A. Stork, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

IX. Literary Intelligence,..... 296

American.—Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Historical and Biographical—Miscellaneous.

British.—Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Historical—Miscellaneous.

German.—Biblical—Historical.

X. Notices of New Publications,..... 298

The Encyclopædia Britannica—The Epoch of the Mammoth, and the Apparition of Man upon the Earth—Foreign Classics for English Readers—The Natural History of Atheism—Life and Times of Thomas Becket—All Saints' Day and other Sermons—Epochs of Modern History—Cyprus: Its Ancient Cities, Tombs and Temples—Popular Astronomy—The Khedive's Egypt, or the Old House of Bondage under New Masters—History of the English People—Daniel, The Beloved—Our Children's Songs—Lost Forever—The Supernatural Factor in Religious Revivals—The Historical Student's Manual—The Telephone—Between the Gates—The Ancient Life-History of the Earth—Democracy in Europe—On the Study of Words—A History of Latin Literature—Boston Monday Lectures—Iowa und Missouri—Memorabilia of Rev. Lucas Rauss—Localities of the Reformation.

The following books arrived too late for notice in this number:

From J. B. Lippincott & Co., "The Last Times," by Dr. Seiss.

From the American Tract Society (Phila.), "Life and Death Eternal," By Samuel C. Bartlett, D. D.; "All for Christ:" A Sketch of the Life and Labors of the Rev. Charles H. Payson. Edited by his brother; "The Old Bible and the New Science," By J. B. Thomas, D. D.; "Plain Progressive Talks upon the Way of Salvation," By Rev. David R. Breed.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF THE

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

JULY, 1878.

ARTICLE I.

THE APPARITION AT ENDOR.

By L. A. Gotwald, D. D., York, Penna.

There is a very marked and sad contrast between the condition and character of Saul, the first king of Israel, at the beginning of his long reign of forty years, and his condition and character at the close of it.

The opening, like the dawning of some cloudless and beautiful summer morning, was most hopeful and auspicious. Majestic in stature, wise in counsel, brave in spirit, pious at least in his inclinations and professions, admired and idolized by the people, chosen and designated miraculously by God Himself for the office, and inducted into it by Samuel, the nation's greatest and most venerated prophet, never did the reign of any monarch begin with more cheering tokens of honor to himself, of blessing to the people, and of glory to God, than did that of Saul.

But a woful and wonderful change came over all this bright beginning. An other and evil spirit soon took possession of the king's heart, and to the power of this evil spirit he gradually yielded himself until, at last, it completely mastered him. He became self-conceited, self-reliant, self-willed. He

chafed under the faithful rebukes of Samuel; usurped the priestly functions of the prophet; daringly resolved on war without consulting God; became morose, gloomy, wretched; endeavored to murder David; slaughtered eighty-five of the Lord's priests; in a word gave himself up wholly to do evil, entirely forsook God, and God as a consequence, at last, also utterly forsook him. "Thou hast done foolishly," was the language of Samuel to him, "thou hast not kept the commandments of thy God; thou hast rebelled, and rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, therefore, because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, He also hath rejected thee." And this, at the time of the incident at Endor, was his condition. His reign was now drawing to a close. His sun was going down, but going down in gloom and darkness. The Philistines, as they often before had done, had invaded the land, and were encamped in the plain of Esdraelon, on the southern slope of the range of hills, called the hill of Moreh, near by the town of Shunem. On the opposite side of the plain towards the south on the rise of Mount Gilboa, very near where Gideon's camp had once been pitched against the Midianites, hard by the spring which, from the fear and trembling of Gideon's companions, had been called the spring of Harod, or "trembling," the army of Israel lay encamped. It was night—the night before the battle. Saul was distressed. He was filled with forebodings of disaster on the morrow. Looking down from the heights of Gilboa over the hosts of the Philistines covering the plain, he "was afraid," we read, "and his heart trembled exceedingly." And no wonder. He was left all alone in the great emergency. There was no one with whom he could take counsel, or from whom he could receive advice with regard to the conduct and result of the coming battle. In the language of Stanley: "The Spirit of the Lord which had roused him in former years, had now departed from him. There was now no harp of the Shepherd Psalmist to drive away the evil spirit. He inquired of the Lord in his distress, but the Lord answered him not. No vision was vouchsafed him, no intimation of the divine will by dream nor by the Urim and Thummin of the High Priest's breast-

plate, no consoling voice of the Prophet of God, for Samuel had long since gone to his rest in the grave. All these usual methods of receiving answers from God failed him now in the great emergency which was upon him. He had forsaken God, and God now had also forsaken him, and was deaf to all his cries for counsel and help."

Thus cut off from all divine response to his inquiries, he resolves in his distress, to seek for counsel and help through the forbidden means of necromancy. "Seek me," he said, "a woman that hath a familiar spirit," or according to the Hebrew "a woman a mistress of *Ob*," *i. e.* a woman who had some supposed spirit so under her control as that it would come at her call, even as the servants of a family come at the call of their master. The original Hebrew word here used means "*bottle*"—a *leathern bottle*—and the analogy seems to be that as a bottle supposes something contained within it, so the body of such a woman is supposed to have some personal presence or force within her, other than human. And this analogy, therefore, suggests the probability that ventriloquism was one of the arts by which such a sorceress practiced upon the credulity and superstition of the people; the pretense being that this other (apparent) voice is that of the spirit; the art of ventriloquism enabling them to produce sounds which seemed to come from a distance, or from the underworld, or from some pretended person in some other room or place. The Septuagint also, in harmony with this thought, here uses *εγγαστρίμυθον*, a ventriloquist. It should also here be noticed that necromancy, or the holding intercourse with the spirits of the dead, whilst extensively practiced by the early heathen nations, and even by the Israelites themselves, was nevertheless most positively and repeatedly condemned and interdicted in the law of Moses, (Lev. 20 : 6, 27. Deut. 18 : 9, 12.) and is classed in the New Testament amongst "the works of the flesh," (Gal. 5 : 20.) "There shall not be found among you," said God, "any one that useth divination, or is an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a counseler with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer; for all that do these thing are an abomina-

tion unto the Lord." Again, "The soul that turneth after such as have familiar spirits, I will set my face against that soul, I will cast him off from his people." "The man or woman that hath a familiar spirit shall surely be put to death."

This act, therefore, of Saul in thus seeking counsel from one of this class, was an open and defiant sin against God, a flagrant transgression of the divine command not to consult familiar spirits. And it was utterly inconsistent, also, with his own past and better conduct; for Saul, in obedience to this divine command which he himself was now violating, had, we read, "put away those that had familiar spirits and the wizards out of the land," (1 Sam. 28 : 2). And the very fact that he had done so with terrible thoroughness, explains perhaps why he now commands his servants to seek him a *woman* that hath a familiar spirit; a woman and not a man, simply because the wizards, or male practitioners, being better known, had all been extirpated, whilst women, being more in privacy, some of them perhaps had escaped destruction and could still be found.

And this, also, was the case. A woman having a familiar spirit, just such an one as Saul had asked for, was soon found. She dwelt at Endor—or the Fountain of Dor—about seven miles from the camp of Israel, and directly beyond the encampment of the Philistines; so that Saul, in this midnight adventure, journeyed some fourteen miles, and had to pass, by a circuitous route, right over or around the ridge along which the Israelites lay, until he came to the hut or cave of the sorceress.

Who she was we do not know. Jewish tradition represents her as being the mother of Abner, one of Saul's generals, and her life, it is said, was spared because of this relationship; but all this, no doubt, is mere groundless Jewish speculation.

But to her, whoever she was, as to one who still held converse with the other world, came, in the dead of night, three unknown guests. They were Saul, and according to Jewish tradition, Abner and Amasa. The King, disguised so as to

be unknown by the woman, at once made known to her his wish. And what did he especially desire? Communion or conversation with the prophet Samuel. "And he said I pray thee divine unto me by the familiar spirit, and bring me him up whom I shall name unto thee," (Sam. 28 : 8). And afterward, being assured of her safety, when she asked, "Whom shall I bring up unto thee?" Saul said, "Bring me up Samuel," (1 Sam. 28 : 11 . A request, by the way, which is proof that men then not only believed in the future and separate existence of the soul after death, but also in its conscious activity in that separate state. Hearing this request, the woman at first refused. But receiving the king's solemn pledge that no harm should come to her from it, she consented. And here let it be noted that there is every probability that the woman knew, in a very short time, who Saul was. His extraordinary stature; the deference paid him, no doubt, by his attendants; the easy distance of the camp of Israel from Endor; the proposal to call up Samuel, the first prophet and magistrate of the nation, whom only one high in official position would dare thus to summon; and the very oath, pledging her protection; all these circumstances must have convinced her that the person before her was none other than Saul himself, notwithstanding her subsequent pretended surprise and question "why hast thou deceived me, for thou art Saul," (1 Sam. 28 : 12). And hence, especially if encouraged, as she probably was, by the gift also of a large fee, and assured of her safety, and prepared by her knowledge both of Samuel and Saul to execute her deceptive art successfully, she complies, says to the king, "Whom shall I bring up unto thee," *i. e.*, Whom shall I invoke from Sheol, Hades, the the invisible subterranean world, which, according to the popular ideas of the Hebrews, was the temporary abode of departed souls. Saul in reply said, "Bring me up Samuel." And at once she attempted to do as he bade her. Plying her incantations, and summoning forth from the spirit world, by her magical spells, the soul or spirit of the great prophet, immediately also that spirit, or some image or personation of it, appeared. The spectre or apparition, however, alarmed the

pythoness, and overwhelmed her with fear. "And when the the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice," and in her trepidation and confusion and fear, (not of Saul, but of this unexpected appearance from the other world, this seeming spirit of the great and majestic prophet himself) she turns to the king and asks, "Why hast thou deceived me—thou are Saul," (1 Sam. 28 : 12). And this astonishment when she first saw Samuel, or what at least seemed to her to be him, proves that she was an arrant impostor; that she never had called up any one from the spirit world, and had no power to do so, and had not in this instance expected to do so, but was a mere wicked pretender, making use of ventriloquism and kindred arts to make people believe that she possessed such power. Like all spiritualists, ancient and modern, who profess power to call up and commune with departed spirits, she was a liar and a fraud, cunningly and wickedly, and for her own advantage, availing herself of the credulity and superstition and wickedness of others.

But he said to her, "Be not afraid—what sawest thou?" "And the woman said unto Saul, I saw gods (a god, *i. e.*, a dignitary, a ruler, *Elohim*,) ascending out of the earth." And Saul said, "What form is he of? What is his appearance?" "And she said an old man cometh up,"—seen to be old from his white locks,—"and he is covered with a mantle,"—an outer tunic, longer than the common one, one worn only by persons of rank, and especially by persons engaged officially in the divine service, a prophetic or "sacerdotal mantle." And then, at once, from the description, thus given by the woman, of the apparition, Saul "perceived," *i. e.*, recognized, knew it to be Samuel. "And Saul perceived it to be Samuel, and he stooped with his face to the ground, and bowed himself. And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up? And Saul answered, I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets nor by dreams: therefore I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do. Then said Samuel, "Wherefore then dost thou ask of me, seeing

the Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine enemy? And the Lord hath done to him, as he spake by me: for the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand, and given it to thy neighbor, even to David: Because thou obeyedst not the voice of the Lord, nor executedst his fierce wrath upon Amalek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee this day. Moreover, the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee into hand of the Philistines; and to-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me: the Lord also shall deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines," (1 Sam. 28: 14–19). Terrible words! No wonder that "then Saul fell straitway all along on the earth, and was sore afraid, because of the words of Samuel!" (1 Sam. 28 : 20).

But, then was no time for delay. And hence, although exhausted by long abstinence, and overwhelmed with mental distress, and now driven to despair by what he had heard, with a sad depression of spirits which no words can express, the king bravely returned to the camp, marshalled his army, led them forth to the battle, and as the apparition at Endor had predicted, was, the next day, together with his sons, in the spirit world: "So Saul died, and his three sons, and his armor-bearer, and all his men that same day together," (1 Sam. 31 : 6).

Having now rehearsed and expounded the successive incidents and circumstances in this narrative of Saul and the witch of Endor, we are prepared to ask, and also answer, several questions which vitally affect a correct understanding of the whole transaction.

1. *Was there here an actual apparition, or was it all merely the device of an artful sorceress?*

There are some considerations which furnish room to suppose that it was all a mere imposture or deception practiced by the woman. The very character of her profession, known to be, as it is, one of deception; the fact that she evidently knew who Saul was; her knowledge, also, of the appearance, dress, and manner of Samuel, whom she had herself perhaps seen, or often heard described, and whom, therefore, she could easily personate; her power as a ventriloquist, by which she

could imitate the voice of Samuel and represent it as speaking out of the ground, or from some distant room or part of the building; Saul's prostrate condition, bowed down to the earth during the pretended appearance and address of Samuel to him; his agitated and distressed state of mind unfitting him for the detection of the deception practiced upon him; all these facts, and others, have inclined some to the opinion that there was no apparition at all, and that the appearance of Samuel, and his address to Saul, were all the mere cunning pretence and trickery of the woman. But this opinion is probably erroneous. A careful view of the narrative, and of all the facts related, demand the admission that there was here an actual apparition. The fact, according to the narrative, that there was an appearance of something extraordinary, *before* the woman began her incantations; the fact that she herself was surprised and terror-stricken at the appearance; the fact that it is distinctly asserted that Saul saw the appearance and perceived that it was Samuel, and spoke to it, and was spoken to by it; and the fact that the tenor of the entire passage indicates and assumes that there was an actual or real appearance; all these facts compel the belief that this, also, was actually the case. And hence we answer the first question by saying: There was here an actual or real appartion.

2. *Assuming that there was thus really an apparition, by whom was it produced or called up?*

In reply to this question it may be said, *first*, that it was *not* called up by the necromantic power or art of the woman. This is evident from the fact of the woman's own manifest surprise and amazement at the apparition; the fact of its appearance before she had ever, so far as we are told, tried to summon it; and the fact that it is, in the nature of the case, impossible to suppose that God would accord to any one the power to do what in His word He expressly condemns as sin, and forbids being done; nor can any one have this power without divinely receiving it. The woman then did not call up this apparition.

Nor, *secondly*, did God Himself, we think, call it up. Many

suppose that God here actually did re-invest the soul of Samuel with some kind of corporeal covering resembling his former body, and, in order to make an impressive utterance of his will to Saul, did really and literally send the prophet thus to him. Now, no one will deny that if God saw fit to do so, He had the power thus to clothe the spirit of Samuel with some kind of temporary and visible form and voice, and thus send it back again to earth on such a mission. But we do not believe that He did here do so. And we doubt His having done so, first, because if He did, then is this a solitary instance in which God permitted the dead to reappear to the living for the purpose of confirming truths previously revealed. And then, also, secondly, would God here have, at least seemingly, countenanced the falsehood, that men and women can call up the dead and commune with them; because, on the supposition that He did thus cause Samuel here to appear, the fact that He did, at this time and place, and under the circumstances then and there existing, do so, would evidently be an indirect, and yet strong endorsement of the pretensions which the witch of Endor made, and of the claims which necromancers and spiritualists now put forth; an endorsement of the very thing which in His word He most emphatically forbids and threatens with punishment. And then, thirdly, there is no reason, from the language of the apparition, to suppose that God did here really send Samuel to Saul, because there was nothing said to Samuel which he had not already been often told, or which was of sufficient necessity or importance to demand thus a special messenger from the spirit world. In other words the character of the revelation made does not justify the supposition that a divinely sent messenger made it. God then, we think, did not here call up this apparition.

But now, if neither the *woman*, by her incantations, here called up or produced this apparition, nor did *God* by His direct and sovereign power over the spirits of the dead do so, then *who did?* By whom *was* this apparition of the dead prophet there, at the hour of midnight, and in that

dark abode of that weird and wicked witch of Endor, and at the request of that depraved and God-rejected King of Israel, by whom was it brought up? We answer, "*by the devil!* And hence this apparition was not the spirit of Samuel at all, but was merely a Satanic personation—a mere counterfeit-likeness of the great prophet—an apparition, yet a fictitious one! And we adopt this view of the case for the following reasons:

(1) Because since, for the reasons given, neither the woman nor God called up the apparition, the devil alone could have done it; and since he could not possibly call up the real Samuel, what he did present was a counterfeit likeness merely of the real one.

(2) Because there is nothing in the narrative which positively and absolutely contradicts this theory.

(3) Because it is in thorough harmony with God's method of dealing with those who, like Saul and this bad woman of Endor, give themselves up to sin. God, in consequence, and as a just retribution, gives them up; He allows Satan power to deceive them, and to deceive each other, so that they will believe lies, that they all may be damned!

(4) Because the narrative itself, or language rather, uttered here by this apparition, receives, it seems to us, a much more harmonious and striking significance, on the assumption that the speaker is *Satan*, by divine permission, *personating* Samuel, than it can possibly have upon any other theory. The spectre, *e. g.* personating Samuel, asks "Why hast thou disquieted me to bring me up?" But as Matthew Henry says, "it is not in the power of witches to disturb the rest of good men nor would the true Samuel have acknowledged such power in magical arts." Again, when Saul makes his complaint, and tells how God has forsaken him, *had* it been the true Samuel to whom he was speaking, the prophet would have bid him, no doubt, repent and pray for forgiveness; but instead of that the spectre represents his case as utterly hopeless, and says just what was calculated to drive Saul to despair, and to discourage him from all thought of appeal for pardon, and thus make sure of his final and eternal ruin.

How like the devil, then, to have spoken to Saul at that time, just in that way! And how probable that he here dealt with Saul, just as he long afterward dealt with Judas; first tempting him, and then tormenting him; first persuade him to sin, and then persuade or drive him to suicide!

(5) And still one other reason for the adoption of this view is, because it is the view which has commended itself to a large number of the most spiritual and judicious, as well as learned commentators. Bishops Patrick, Willet, Poole, Henry, Brown, and many other commentators, especially among the Germans, adopt the theory that the apparition here presented, was a counterfeit representation merely of Samuel, and that it was produced by Satan, under divine permission, as a just retribution and deeper delusion, leading him on to darkness and death; an awful moral penalty inflicted upon one who had once enjoyed much light and many privileges, but had despised and rejected them all, and yielded himself up, more and more, to the influence and power of Satan, until now God, also, had utterly withdrawn Himself from him, and completely given him up as the wretched prey of the great enemy and destroyer of his soul.

(6) And there is still one other reason which inclines us to this view of the narrative before us, viz. that it is in entire keeping with, and explains, and exhibits the super-human, or the spiritual factor in all our modern Spiritualism. Admit the satanic agency, which we have claimed as the super-human factor in this case of spiritualism, here at Endor, and you have, we believe, the key which will explain all the superhuman power or agency really possessed by modern necromancers, or exercised by modern spiritualists. Our modern spiritualism, claiming to call up the dead, and hold communion with them, is, we are satisfied, of *the devil!* The devil counterfeits or personates the dead, and thus deludes those who seek communion with them, into the belief that they actually do also commune with them. For by a physiological law of our being, and by an established principle of His moral government over men, God, as a righteous retribution for turning away from the truth, as revealed in His word,

delivers men unto satan, to be blinded, and deceived, and finally damned. The Holy Spirit gradually withdraws His suggestions and guidance from them. Conscience sinks down into silence and sleep. The moral sensibilities become blunted and seared. Reason becomes perverted. The judgment comes under the sway of the passions. The soul's capacity to make moral distinctions aud discernments gradually fades out and ceases. Rejecting the light, it at last loses the power to receive the light. Despising the truth, it at last, by a singular distortion of his faculties, believes and accepts even the grossest errors as truth. As even a heathen poet, centuries ago, observes:

> "Fas atque nefas, exiguo fine, libidinum
> Discernunt avidi."—HORACE.

Or, as an inspired prophet, long before Horace wrote his mellifluous verses, expressed it, men by persistent disobedience to the light, as God gives it to them, at length come into that state of utter mental and moral perversion when they will call evil good, and good evil, when they will put darkness for light and light for darkness, and when they will put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter. (Isaiah 5 : 20).

And all this, according to scripture, is simply a just divine retribution for men's deliberate rejection of the truth and preference of error. God simply gives them up, without restraint, to the power of the evil one, whose lies they prefer to his pure and immutable truths. "For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance; but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath. Wherefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing, see not; and hearing, they hear not; neither do they understand," (Matt. 13 : 12, 13). "And Jesus said, For judgment I am come into this world; that they which see not might see, and that they which see might be made blind," (John 9 : 39). "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of

God, should shine unto them," (2 Cor. 4 : 3, 4). "The mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth, will let until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusions, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness," (2 Thess. 2 : 7—12).

ARTICLE II.

THE ETHIOPIC BOOK OF BARUCH.

By Rev. George H. Schodde, A. M., Ph. D., Alleghany, Pa.

INTRODUCTION.

Ethiopic literature is a field comparatively uncultivated in America. The relative unimportance of Abyssinia, socially and politically considered, the semi-barbarism of a narrow-minded treacherous people, hidden among high and almost inaccessible mountains, their suspicious reception of all who come near the "Land of the Queen of Sheba," together with the conviction that such a nation could not produce a literature worth mentioning—all this has had the effect of checking our interest in this people. If to this we add, that the literary monuments produced during a more civilized period of Ethiopic history, and taken by travelers and soldiers to Europe, are still hidden in manuscript-form and scattered among the libraries of England, Germany, and France, it will not surprise us that Ethiopic scholars in our country should be rather rare. Even in Europe, where access to famous libraries and good Ethiopic MSS. is comparatively easy, the literature of this old Christian country has not awakened the interest of theologians as other discoveries bearing less di-

rectly on theology have done. The cuneiform-inscriptions of Babylon and Nineveh have attracted more wise heads in the theological world than has the literature of a nation which was among the first to embrace the religion of Christ.

Before the time of the Reformation nobody thought of paying any attention to the language of Ethiopia, but about the middle of the sixteenth century an edition of the New Testament in this language was published in Rome, by the Abyssinian Tesfa-Zion, (*i. e.*, hope of Zion). This created some excitement, and induced a few, mainly Germans, scholars to attempt to master the intricacies of this language. The interest, however, soon subsided, till it was thoroughly revived again by Job Ludolf between 1650 and 1710. Ludolf, having enjoyed the instruction of a native Bishop of Abyssinia, Gregorius by name, expelled from his country for sympathizing with Rome, published his "Lexicon Æthiopic-latinum" in 1661. A second edition, much improved, was issued 1702. His grammar was the first attempt at a systematic analysis of the language, and his "Historia Æthiopica," together with the the complete "Commentarius in Hist. Æthop." is a perfect thesaurus of valuable information concerning this country. No one attempted to follow in the path of Ludolf for two centuries. Here and there indeed a small text, or an insignificant treatise on some specific grammatical point was published, but on the whole, Ludolf remained the sole authority in this species of learning until about thirty-five years ago, when Dr. Dillman, now Prof. in Berlin, determined to make Ethiopic a specialty. He first aroused an interest in this tongue by the publication of some translations (such as Henoch and Liber Jubilæorum,) and then, proceeding from the philosophical basis of a comparative semitic philology, published a thorough and masterly grammar, "Grammatik der Æthiopischen Sprache" 1857. After having edited quite a number of Ethiopic texts, among which the "Octateuchus Æthiopicus, the "Chrestomathia Æthiopica," and the "Liber Henoch," are the most important, he, in 1866, gave to the learned world that work of astonishing erudition and patient labor, the "Lexicon Linguæ Æthiopicæ, cum Indice Latino." He

has through his labors placed the study of Ethiopic on an equally certain and philosophical footing as the other semitic languages, and consequently the number of those who are devoting their attention to this language is daily increasing.

The literature of Ethiopia is *καὶ ἐξοχήν* a theological one, embracing chiefly works translated from the nations which were religiously associated with the Abyssinians. These foreign nations were first the Byzantine-Greeks, either directly or indirectly through the Copts, and then, after the rise of the religion of the Koran, the Arabs. Of course, the greater part of their literature has been translated from the Greek, not only on account of the affinity of religion, both being Christians, but also because the Arabic conquest is contemporaneous with the "beginning of the end" of Abyssinian literary glory. The language had to undergo the process of gradual decay. Subjection to a foreign power of a strange religion, crippled the political and religious energies of the people, until now their condition is a mockery of the greatness they once enjoyed, and their dialects, the Amharic and Tigré, are but a sorrowful reflection of the once noble tongue a noble race spoke. True, the Bible is still read in their churches in the same tongue in which the congregations heard it fifteen hundred years ago—but neither priest nor layman can understand it. It is the old sacred tongue, just as Latin is to the Roman Catholics.

The Bible, as the noblest and best specimen of Ethiopic translations, naturally attracts our attention first, especially as our Book of Baruch is considered a part of the sacred codex and has canonical authority. The version used in Abyssinia has not been made from the original Hebrew, although a sister-tongue of the Ethiopic, but from the Septuagint. About the time of the conversion of the Abyssinians to Christianity, the authority of the Septuagint, mainly through the ignorance of Hebrew among the church-fathers, stood very high. It was even regarded as inspired by many of the early fathers of the Church, *e. g.* by Justin the Martyr, "*Cohortatio ad Græcos.*" Consequently it is not a matter at all surprising that there was no hesitancy about translating the

word of God from another translation.* The translation has not been made by *one* person, nor is it from a Greek text exactly like our Septuagint. It is possible, and even probable, that *some* of the translators understood Hebrew, and used it in portions of the work. Although the Ethiopians were a highly religious people, and ecclesiastical authority stood higher than political, they apparently had no very definite idea of what inspiration was, and therefore, led on by the ascetic propensities of their nature, they received into their canon quite a number of books which were never accepted by the Greek Church. By this process the Abyssinian Church gradually obtained a canon of eighty one books, from which fact, too, they at the present time call the Bible "Samanja hade," *i. e.* eighty-one (books). Not *all* the Ethiopic MSS. of the Bible contain these eighty-one books; there are in all seventy-three books which have obtained canonical authority in *all* the churches of that country. Of these, forty-six belong to the Old, and twenty-seven to the New Testament. The Old Testament is divided into four "tomes," as follows: 1st, called the Orah (*i. e.* law) or the Octateuchus, embracing the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth; 2d, the Kings, *i. e.* two books of Samuel and two of Kings, called the four books of the kings in the LXX, the two books of Chronicles, two books of Ezra, (*i. e.* Nehemiah and Ezra), Tobit, Judith, Esther, Job, Psalms; 3d, called Solomon, embracing Proverbs, the so-called Makbeb, *i. e. concio* or congregation, the Song of Songs, the Wisdom of Solomon, and a book called Sirak (Ecclesiasticus, or Ecclesiastes); 4th, Prophets, embracing Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Lamentations, Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. As appendices are added the two books of Maccabees. The New Testament, like the Old, is divided into four parts, and has an Appendix.

---

*Even the mistakes of the LXX are rendered literally. I remember, years ago, in reading a MS. translation of one of the minor prophets the senseless translation of לָחֵם by bread (mistaking it for לֶחֶם) was soberly imitated by the Ethiop. translator.

Part I. is called "The Gospel," and embraces Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Part II. contains only the Acts. Part III. called Paul, embraces Romans, two Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, two to Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Hebrews. Part IV. is called "The Apostle," and contains James, two of Peter, three of John and Jude. The Appendix is termed: "The vision of John." To these are annexed under the title of Synodos, the apostolic constitutions or canons divided into eight parts, thus completing the Ethiopic Bible with 81 books.

To the book of Jeremiah are usually appended, besides the Baruch of the LXX., which there and here forms a separate book, four smaller books as follows: 1st, Lamentations; 2nd, an apocryphal letter of Jeremiah, according to the LXX.; 3d, the fragment of a prophecy, the basis of Matth. 27 : 9, a very small thing of only a few lines; and 4th, the Baruch, of which we give a translation. There are then *two* Baruchs in the Abyssinian Church having canonical authority, the one translated from the LXX., and the one before us. We can therefore also easily understand why it is called "*the remainder of the words of Baruch*," as an addition or supplement to the original book which did not enter into historical details sufficiently for a wonder-loving generation. The original writer was not an Ethiopian but a Greek, and so our book, like all the noblest specimens of Ethiopic literature, is a translation. It will be unneccessary to prove this, as this is clear at first glance to every one acquainted with Ethiopic literature and language. However, a part of the title and probably a part of the book (the portion referring to Abemelech) is a work of the translator. A member of the Jewish or of the Greek Christian Church would never attempt to gain canonical authority for a book of this kind; the translator, well knowing that it did not enjoy such authority among the Greeks, took into consideration the natural propensities of his countrymen, and their appreciation of anything that was wonderful or marvelous, and therefore added to the title

"which is not apocryphal," and so what was impossible in the Greek Church, became possible in the Ethiopic. That the portion referring to Abemelech is a work of the translator, appears probable from the fact that that portion is peculiar to this book, while nearly all the others are found in other apocryphal works written during the time of Israel's longing for a Messiah, when the word of God was so often deemed insufficient, and its "*lacunae*" were filled out by the ingenious thoughts of pious souls, who thought it no harm "*ad maiorem Dei gloriam*," to perpetrate a "*pia fraus*." Such fables are found, *e. g.*, in the Maccabees, in the apocryphal Baruch, in the Syriac literature, in the Assenci Isaiæ, &c., &c. Some parts, *e. g.* the putting away of strange wives are simply embellishments of biblical accounts.

The whole book is, of course, without any historical value whatever, and can be relied on only as far as it can be controlled by trustworthy testimony. Its value consists in its bringing before our eyes vividly a specimen of a kind of literature, that flourished so abundantly from about two centuries before Christ, down to three or four after Him—viz., an apocryphal literature growing out of an unnatural and unhealthy craving after the marvelous and supernatural. Just the precise period when this Baruch was written cannot be decided. If Jeremiah's prophecy concerning the sonship of Christ, is to be looked upon as a later addition, as a *post eventum* prophecy, possibly as a work of the translator, then it may as a whole be looked upon as a production of a Jewish writer; if, however, that prediction was put there by the original composer, then this Baruch must have been written *after* Christ. In the pre-Christian apocryphal literature, there are indeed many allusions to the coming Messiah, but none so plain as this. This part is undoubtedly the work of a Christian, who *knew* of Christ as the Son of God, not of a Jew, who *expected* a Messiah according to the ideas prevalent during the years immediately preceding Christ's birth. The theological contents are thus, on account of the uncertain historical basis, of very little value. The whole production has a value, only as the exponent of a certain age, and its re-

ception into the Abyssinian canon, speaks volumes for the peculiarities of that people.

This Baruch is no longer retained in Greek, not even in a fragmentary form. In its Ethiopic dress it is found in all biblical MSS. Dillmann, who published it for the first time in his "Chrestomathia Æthiopica, p. 1—15 used three MSS. There is no division into chapters or verses.* The division into nine parts, adopted in this translation, is the same that Praetorius, in his German rendering in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift, 1872, p. 231, used. It was made by him according to the sense of the context. The Ethiopic text has not been preserved in its integrity, consequently there are quite a number of passages which necessarily must receive a doubtful translation.

[TRANSLATION.]

THE REMAINDER OF THE WORDS OF BARUCH (WHICH ARE NOT APOCRYPHAL) CONCERNING THE TIME OF THE CAPTIVITY AT BABYLON.†

I. And it came to pass when the king of the Chaldees took captive the children of Israel, God spoke to Jeremiah and said to him: Jeremiah, my chosen-one, arise and depart from this city, thou and Baruch, for I am about to destroy it on account of the multitude of the sins of those who live in it; for thy prayer is, Like a strong pillar in the midst of the city, and like a fence of adamant around it.‡ Therefore

---

* This is a good old Ethiopic style of doing things. Only the best translations, such as of the Bible and Henoch have any marks of division, and there they are often an insult to the connection.

† This decidedly apocryphal book is found now only in the Ethiopic as a translation from the Greek. In the Abyssinian Church it is affixed to the book of Jeremiah and has canonical authority. It is called the "*Remainder of the Words of Baruch.*" because it is the last of the five appendices of Jeremiah. It was published for the first time by Prof. Dillman, then in Giessen, in the year 1866. A German translation is to be found in Hilgenfeld's "Zeitschrift" for 1872, p. 231 ff., made by Praetorius of Berlin. Cf. Herzog's Realencyclopædie. Vol. XII., p. 314.

‡Cf. Jer. 1 : 18 and 15 : 20.

arise ye, and go and depart, before the host of the Chaldees comes and surrounds the city. Then spoke Jeremiah saying: I beg of Thee, my Lord, command Thy servant that he may speak before Thee; and God said to him: Speak, my chosen-one, Jeremiah. Then spoke Jeremiah saying: O Lord, Thou who rulest all things, wilt Thou turn this chosen city over into the hands of the Chaldees, that the king may boast with his people saying: I have overcome that city of God! Far be it, O Lord! If it be Thy will, destroy it with *Thine own* hands. And the Lord said to Jeremiah: My chosen-one, arise thou, and depart, thou and Baruch, for I am about to destroy it on account of the sins of those who live in it. Neither the king nor his host will be able to enter the city unless *I* go before them and open its gates. Arise, therefore, and go to Baruch and announce to him these words. And arising in the sixth hour of the night, behold I will appear to you in the gate of the city. If *I* do not go before in the destruction of the city, they will not be able to enter it. And having said this, the Lord departed from Jeremiah.

II. And Jeremiah then rent his garments and strewed ashes on his head, and went into the temple. And Baruch, seeing Jeremiah with his head covered with ashes, and his garments rent, cried with a loud voice, saying: My father Jeremiah, what aileth thee; and what kind of sin have the people committed? For when the people sinned, Jeremiah mourned and strewed ashes over his head, and prayed for the people that the sin of the people should be forgiven. And Baruch asked him, saying: My father Jeremiah, what aileth thee, and what aileth the people? Then Jeremiah said to him: See to it that we do not rend our garments, but that we rend our hearts,* and that we do not pour water into the pools, that verily we may weep until we fill them with tears; for from now on He will not pity this people. And Baruch said: My father Jeremiah, what aileth thee? And Jeremiah said to him: God has given this city over into the hands of the king of the Chaldees, that he may wickedly lead the peo-

*Cf. Joel II. 13.

ple into captivity. And hearing all this, Baruch rent his garments, and said: My father Jeremiah, what did they enjoin on thee? And Jeremiah said to him: Remain with me till the sixth hour of this night, that thou mayest learn what is the true state of affairs.

III. And when it was the sixth hour of that night, in which God had said to Jeremiah, that he should go out with Baruch, they went to the gate of the city and remained there waiting. And then there was the voice of a trumpet, and angels came from heaven, and in their hands they carried lights of fire, and they stood in the gate of the city. Then Jeremiah and Baruch wept, saying: Now, indeed, do we know that this thing is true. And Jeremiah entreated the angels: I entreat you do not altogether destroy the city till I ask of the Lord one thing. And the Lord spoke to the angel saying: Do not destroy the city till I have spoken to Jeremiah my chosen-one. Then spoke Jeremiah, saying: I entreat Thee, my Lord, command me to speak with Thee. And He said to him: Speak, my chosen-one Jeremiah, whatever thou dost wish! And Jeremiah said to Him: Behold, now we know, my Lord, that Thou hast given over the city into the hands of its enemies, and the nation which is from Babylon will take it; now, what is Thy wish? How shall I put away in a secret place the sacred utensils that are used in the service, and what dost Thou wish that I should put over them? And the Lord said to him: Give them to the earth in the temple, saying, Thou earth, hear the voice of thy Creator, who has created thee with the power of the water, who has sealed thee with two seals, receive thy goods and preserve thy service utensils, till the coming of the Beloved-one. Then spoke Jeremiah, and said: I entreat Thee, my Lord, show me what I shall do with Abemelech,* the Ethiopian, who has watched over the people and Thy servant Jeremiah, much more than all the men of the city; for he drew me out of the pool of mire. And I do not wish that he shall see the ruin and destruction of the city, that he may not be sad. And the

*Cf. Jer. XXXVIII. 7 seq.

Lord said to Jeremiah: Send him to the vineyard of Agrippa, on the hill-path, and I will hide him, until I lead back the people to the city. But thou Jeremiah, go with the people till they come to the country of Babylon, and remain prophesying to them till I lead them back to their city; and as to Baruch, leave him here in Jerusalem. And the Lord spoke all this to Jeremiah, and departed from Jeremiah to heaven. And Jeremiah and Baruch came to the temple, and all the service-vessels they gave to the earth, as the Lord had commanded them; and when the earth had received them, they sat down and wept. And Jeremiah going the next day, sent Abemelech, saying: Take a basket and go the hill-path to the vineyard of Agrippa, and carry some figs to the sick, that the joy and the glory of God be over you. And he went as he had commanded him.

IV. And the host of the Chaldees, coming on the next day, surrounded the city, and a messenger blew a large trumpet and said: Come, host of the Chaldees, behold, the gates are open for you! Then the king and his armies came and took all the people captive. Then Jeremiah took the keys of the temple and went outside of the city, and threw the keys up before the sun, saying: To thee do I speak, O Sun; receive the keys of the house of God, and keep them to the day when God will ask thee for them; for our generation was not worthy to keep them, for thou beholdest us lamenting over our sins. And while Jeremiah was weeping over the people, they conducted him away, transplanting and leading him away with the people to Babylon. And Baruch took ashes and strewed them over his head, and sat down and lamented in this manner, saying: Why is Jerusalem destroyed, unless it be on account of the sin of the beloved people; and it is given over into the hands of its enemies on account of our sins and that of the people. But the sinners shall not boast and say: We were able to take the city of God by our might; it was not by your strength that ye took it, but through our sin it was given to you. But our God will pity us, and will lead us back to our city; but for you there will be no salvation. Blessed are ye, our fathers, Abraham,

Isaac, and Jacob, for ye have left this world and did not see the destruction of this city! After he had said this, he went away weeping, and said: I will lament over thee, Jerusalem. And he went from the city and dwelt in a grove, and the angels came and announced to him everything.

V. And Abemelech took up the figs at noon time whither Jeremiah had sent him, and he found a dense tree and sat down in its shade, that he might rest a little, and he laid his head on the basket of figs, and slept sixty-six years without awaking from his sleep. And after this time he arose and awoke from his sleep, and said: "O that I could sleep yet a little, for my head still feels heavy and my sleep has not refreshed me. And he uncovered the basket of figs and he found the figs fresh, and the milk dripping. And he desired to sleep again, for his head felt heavy and the sleep had not refreshed him; but he said: I am afraid to sleep, lest I come too late, and my father Jeremiah scold me, for anxiously he sent me this morning; but I will arise and go, for the heat burns, and it will not soon cease anywhere. And he arose, and took the basket of figs, and went to the city of Jerusalem, but did not recognize the city or his house. And he said: Blessed art Thou, O God: for a great trouble had come over him. And he said: Is not this the city of Jerusalem? Perhaps I am lost, because I have come the hill-path; or, if not, it is because my head is heavy, and I am not refreshed by my sleep, and my heart is misled. How will I announce this thing to Jeremiah that the city has been changed for me? And he sought every mark that was in the city, that he might discover if it was Jerusalem. And he returned into the city, and searched if there was any one he knew; but he failed. And he said, Blessed art Thou, O God, for a great trouble has come over me: and he went again far from the city, and sat down grieving; and while he went there, he learned nothing. And he put down the basket of figs and said: I will remain here till the Lord removes this uncertainty from me. After he had seated himself, he saw an old man coming from the field, and Abemelech said to him: To thee, sire, do I speak. What city is

this? And the old man said to him: It is Jerusalem. And Abemelech said to him: Where is Jeremiah the Priest, and Baruch the Levite, and all the people of this city, for I can find none? And the old man said to him: Art thou not from this city; dost thou indeed remember Jeremiah, so that thou dost ask concerning him all the days of your abiding here? Jeremiah is in Babylon with the people, for he was taken captive and given into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Persia; and he went to prophesy to them. And when Abemelech heard this from the old man, Abemelech said to him: If thou wert not an old man, verily I would abuse and ridicule thee; but it is not right that an old man or woman should be ridiculed. If it were not thus, verily I would say thou art raving. And concerning what thou sayest, that the people have been led captive to Babylon, even if torrents from heaven had fallen over them, there would not have been time for them to get to Babylon, and thou sayest that they were led captive to Babylon! For as my father Jeremiah sent me, I went to the vineyard of Agrippa with a few figs to give them to the sick who are among the people. And I went and came here, and took what he commanded me, and returned, and as I was going, I found a tree and I sat down under it that I might be in the shade, for it was noon-time, and there I rested on the basket of figs and slept; and awaking it seemed to me I had tarried long, and I uncovered the basket of figs and found the milk dripping just as I had taken them up, my friend, and behold thou hast said: The people have been led captive to Babylon; now behold, and see, that the figs have not withered. And he opened for him the basket of figs and showed them to him; and the old man saw that they were fresh and their milk was dripping. Then the old man was astonished and said to Abemelech: Blessed art thou, my son, the Lord did not wish to show thee the destruction of the city, and God has brought consolation to thee and caused thee not to see. Behold, to-day it is sixty-six years since the people were led captive to Babylon. And if thou desirest to learn and to be convinced, my son, behold, and see the fields, how the seeds

are shooting forth, that it is not the time for figs. And he discovered that it was not the time of all this. Then Abemelech said with a loud voice: I bless Thee, O Lord, my God, the God of heaven and of earth, a resting-place for the souls of the just in every land. And he said to the old man: Which month is this? And he said to him: The twelfth of the month Nizan (which is Majasja).* And after this Abemelech gave the old man some of these figs, and he said to him: The Lord will conduct thee up to His heights, the city Jerusalem.

VI. And Abemelech arose and went outside of the city, and prayed to God, and behold, an angel came and led him to Baruch, and he found him in the grove where he lived. And when they had greeted each other, and wept together and kissed each other, and he, (*i. e.* Baruch) had seen the figs in the basket, he raised his eyes to heaven, and prayed, saying: Great is God who gives the reward to the just. Rejoice, my soul, and be glad; although thou speakest to a dead body as to the holy house;† thy lamentation will be turned into light, for afterwards will come the faithful-one who will lead thee back to thy body. Look into the purity of thy faith, if thou wouldst live. Behold these figs; see, it was sixty-six years since they were picked, and they are not rotten nor have they become putrid, but their milk is dripping until now. Thus will he do over thee, my body, since thou hast kept the command from the angel of justice. He who has guarded the figs will also guard thee with His power. After having spoken thus, Baruch answered Abemelech and said to him: Arise, and we will again pray that the Lord may show us the words that we shall write to Jeremiah to Babylon, concerning the protection He has shown me. And Baruch prayed and said: My power is the Lord God; and the light that comes from His countenance I earnestly petition for, and I bow to

---

* *i. e.* the 8th month in the Abyssinian calendar, beginning with the 8th of April.

†Dillmann says: "hic locus corruptus esse videtur." It is certainly a mysterious prayer.

His goodness. Great is Thy name; none can comprehend it. Hear the prayer of Thy servant, that Thy will may be clear in my heart to do it, and I send it to Thy Priest Jeremiah, in Babylon. And while praying thus, an angel came and said to him: Baruch, thou knower of light, be not tronbled about sending to Jeremiah. To-morrow, at the hour of dawn there will come to thee an eagle; thou thyself provide for Jeremiah, and write a letter, and speak to the children of Israel in this manner: Whosoever is a stranger among you, let him be separated alone on the fifteenth day, and after that I will lead you back to the city, saith the Lord. And if any one is not separated on the fifteenth day, then Jeremiah shall go into the city and admonish the people of Babylon, says the Lord. And the angel having said this, he departed from Baruch. And Baruch sent him (*i. e.* Abemelech) to the village, and he brought parchment and ink, and he wrote as follows:

VII. Thus Baruch, the servant of God, writes a letter to Jeremiah in captivity at Babylon. Joy and happiness! for God will not desert us that we should walk in sadness on account of our disgrace and destruction. Therefore God has become merciful over our tears, and has remembered His covenant with our Fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. He has sent to me an angel, and has announced to me these words which I send to thee. But these are the things God, the Lord of Israel, has done, who led us out of the land of Egypt with fire. But ye have not kept all His statutes, but have raised your hearts, and have stiffened your necks before Him, and He has put you into the furnace of Babylon, for ye have not heard my voice, says the Lord, out of the mouth of Jeremiah, my servant. But those who hear me, them I will conduct out from Babylon, and there shall not be strangers from Jerusalem in Babylon. And if ye seek to know your paths, search for them in the water of the Jordan, and whosoever does not listen will be known by this sign, which is a sign as great as a seal.* And Baruch arose, after having

* This letter is but poorly preserved, and therefore very indefinite.

written thus, and came out of the grove. And an eagle said to him: Hail to thee, Baruch, preserver of the faith! And Baruch said to him: Thou dearest of all the birds of heaven, speak! From the light of thy eyes (I know) thou art truthful; now tell me what art thou doing here? The eagle said to him: I am sent here that thou shouldst entrust me with every word thou desirest. And Baruch said to him, Take these words I have written to Jeremiah in Babylon! And the eagle said to him, For this reason was I sent. And Baruch took the letter and fifteen figs out of the basket of figs that Abemelech had brought, and tied them around the neck of the eagle, and said to him: To thee, O eagle, do I speak, thou king of all the birds, go in peace and in safety! Bring news to us, and be not like the raven that Noah sent which refused to return to him again, but be like the dove which three times returned answer to Noah. Thus thou take these words to Jeremiah and to those who are with him of Israel, as it is good for thee to do, and bring this happiness to the people, the chosen ones of God. And if all the birds and all the enemies of righteousness surround thee, desiring to kill thee, thou wilt be victorious and God will give thee strength, and thou wilt turn neither to the right nor to the left, but, like an arrow, thou wilt go straight. Go, with the aid of God! And Baruch having said this, the eagle flew away with the letter and came to Babylon, and rested on a pillar which was outside of the city in a deserted place. And he rested there until Jeremiah and the rest of the people passed. And they passed there to bury a man who had died, for Jeremiah had asked Nebuchadnezzar saying: give me some land where I can bury my people, and he gave it. And as they came weeping over the dead, they arrived before the eagle, and the eagle cried with a loud voice and said, To thee Jeremiah, the chosen-one of God, do I speak; go, and gather all the people that they may come here, and hear the good news I have brought. And hearing this, he praised the Lord, and then he gathered all the people and their women and their children, and they came to where the eagle was. And the eagle descended on the dead body, and struck it with

his foot, and it became alive. And this thing he did that the people might believe, and be astonished at what was taking place. And they said, Perhaps this is the Lord who appeared to our fathers in the wilderness with Moses, and has turned to the likeness of an eagle, and appears to us as this great eagle. And the eagle spoke to Jeremiah saying: Come and hear this letter and read it to the people; and he read it to them. And when the people heard it, they all wept together, and strewed ashes on their heads, and said to Jeremiah, Save us! what shall we do that we may return to our city? And Jeremiah arose and said to them: Everything that ye have heard in the letter, that do, and He will conduct you back to your city. And Jeremiah wrote a letter to Baruch speaking as follows: My beloved son, do not tire in thy prayer when thou dost kneel to God for our sakes, that He may lead us on our paths until we depart from the government of this sinful king, for thou hast found grace before God, who has not suffered thee to come with us that thou shouldst not see the evil that has been brought upon the people in Babylon. Just as when a father, having sons, is handed over and is condemned, and they who are with their father to comfort him, hide their faces so that they do not see their father stricken by grief, thus has the Lord pitied thee, and has not allowed thee to come to Babylon, that thou shouldst not see the great trouble of the people. For since we have come to this city, to this day we have not rested from grief; it is sixty-six years to-day that we have sought to be free from being a people tortured by Nebuchadnezzar the king, weeping and saying: Pity us, O Lord, Sor.* And when I heard this speech I grieved and cried, when they cried again to the Lord of the tortured ones, saying: Pity us! And again I remembered the festival which we had in Jerusalem, before we were led captive, and remembering this I returned to my house afflicted and weeping. And now pray to our Lord where ye are, thou and Abemelech, for the peo-

---

*Sor. Heb. שׂוֹר taken from the syllable-zarin Nebuchadnezzar, Ethiop. Nebukadnazor.

ple that they may hear my voice and the words of my mouth, that they may depart from Persia. For in truth I say to you, all the days we have lived here, they have taken hold of us saying: Sing to us a new song of the songs of Zion, the songs of your God! And we said to them: How can we sing for you, for we are in the land of the stranger? And having written thus, Jeremiah tied the letter to the neck of the eagle, and said to him: Go in peace! the Lord will protect thee; And the eagle went and flew, and brought the letter to Baruch, and taking it, Baruch read the letter and wept when he heard the ills of the people and their troubles. And Jeremiah took the figs and gave them to the poor that were among the people. And he remained that he might teach them not to do the deeds of the people of Babylon.

VIII. And when the day had come on which God led forth the people out of Babylon, the Lord said to Jeremiah: Arise, thou and the people, and go to the Jordan, and say to the people: The Lord desires to pardon the deeds of this people in Babylon. We will examine the men who have married wives into your midst and the women who have married away from you; and whosoever will hear thee, I will conduct back to Jerusalem, and whosoever does not hear thee shall not enter it. And Jeremiah read all this to them, and brought them to the Jordan that he might examine them. And when he spoke to them these words, which the Lord had spoken to him, they separated, those that had married did not wish to hear Jeremiah, and some said: We will never leave our wives, we will take them with us to our city. And they left the Jordan and came to Jerusalem. Then stood up Jeremiah and Baruch and Abemelech saying: no man who has married out of Babylon shall enter our city! Then said those who had married the women to their neighbors: Arise, we will return to Babylon And they left and returned. And when the people of Babylon saw them, they went out to hinder their approach, and did not allow them to enter into Babylon, saying: Ye were formerly our enemies, and secretly went from us; on this account ye shall not enter our city, for we have sworn in the name of our God that we will

not receive you and your children, for ye have left us secretly. And hearing them thus, they returned to Jerusalem, and built for themselves cities in the neighborhood, and they call (one particular) city Samaria. And Jeremiah sent to them saying: Repent! behold the angel of justice will come and lead you back to your place which is afar off!

IX. And they remained rejoicing and sacrificing for seven days, on account of the people. And on the tenth day, after this was done, Jeremiah sent up a sacrifice alone. And Jeremiah prayed saying: Holy! Holy! Holy! art Thou; a sweet incense to men, and a light which in truth shone for me till I came before Thee. I entreat Thee on account of Thy people, and ask Thee on account of the mild voice of the Seraphim, and the sweet incense of the Cherubim; I ask Thee also for the musician Michael, the angel of justice, he who opens the gates of justice, till they enter them. I entreat Thee, Lord over all, and the Lord who possesses all things, and has created every thing that is seen, and what was not born, all that He finished, and all secret creation was with Him, before it was made in secret. And this he prayed, and having finished his prayer, Jeremiah stood up in the temple, and with him were Baruch and Abemelech. And Jeremiah became like a man whose soul had departed from him. Then Baruch and Abemelech fell down, and lamented with a loud voice, saying: Woe to us, our father Jeremiah, the Priest of God, has left us! And hearing this the people ran to him, and found Jeremiah fallen and dead, and they wept and rent their garments and strewed ashes over their heads, and wept bitterly. And afterwards when they prepared to bury him, there came a voice which said: Do not put the shroud on him; he is alive, and his soul will return to his body again! And hearing this voice they did not put him in the shroud, but put him so that they could watch him about three days till the soul would return to the body. And there was a voice in the midst of them all saying: Worship with one voice! worship the Lord! all ye worship the Messiah! the Son of God, who will raise you from the dead and will judge you, Jesus the Son of God, a light to all the world, and a lamp

that will not be extinguished, and a salvation which is of faith! And after this there will yet be three hundred and thirty Sabbaths to the day of the coming of the tree of life, which was in the garden (*i. e.* of Eden); and it was not planted to change every tree that produces fruit; but the dry ones, when they come near it, it causes them to bring forth fruit, and germinate, and their fruit remains with the angels. For this reason are the trees planted that they germinate and grow up. We give tribute to the air that its roots may not wither like a plant whose roots the ground does not hold. And what was of a red color will become white like wool, and water which was sweet will become bitter, and the bitter will become sweet with great joy. And the joys of God will be to the islands that they produce fruit in the words of the mouth of His Son. And He Himself will come into the world, and will select for Himself twelve Apostles, that there may appear to them He whom I have seen beautiful, sent from the Father, who will come into the world, and on the Mount of Olives He will make the covenant and He will satisfy the hungry soul. Thus spoke Jeremiah concerning the Son of God, that He was to come into the world. And when the people heard this they were enraged concerning it, and they said: These are the words of Isaiah, the son of Amos, when he said: I see God, the Son of God. Therefore arise, we will do to him as we did to Isaiah. And a part of them said: No! But then we will stone him! Then Baruch and Abemelech cried out to them, saying: Do not kill him in this manner! And Baruch and Abemelech lamented over Jeremiah, and did not allow him to announce further the secret things he had seen. And Jeremiah said to them: Be quiet! do not lament, for they will not be able to kill me till I have announced to you everything that I have seen. Now bring to me a stone; and they brought a stone to him. He placed it and said: Eternal light, change this stone that it may look like a man! Then the stone changed into the image of Jeremiah, like unto him. Then they commenced to throw at the stone, for it was like Jeremiah. And Jeremiah announced to Baruch and Abemelech every secret thing

he had seen; and, having ended his words, he went and stood in the midst of the people, desiring to end his mission. And then the stone cried out to them and said: O ye foolish children of Israel, why do you stone me, being like Jeremiah, and behold, Jeremiah stands in your midst! And when they saw him, they ran with many stones, and finished his destruction. And they buried him, and took that stone and placed it on his grave, and arranged it for a door and wrote on it, saying: This was the help of Jeremiah!

ARTICLE III.

THE TRUE POSITION OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN RELATION TO THE AUTHORITY OF HUMAN CREEDS, BEFORE THE PUBLICATION OF THE FORM OF CONCORD, IN 1580.

By R. Weiser, D. D., of Georgetown, Colorado.

It must be admitted on all hands that Luther and Melanchthon who were the chief agents in the hands of God in starting and carrying forward the work of the Reformation, started out with the determination of rejecting all mere human authority, in matters of religion. Thus Luther in his Ninety-Five Theses, in 1517, even when he had not yet made up his mind to break with the Church of Rome, puts more stress upon the Bible, than on the decrees of Councils, and the decretals of the Popes; and in his noble defence at the Diet of Worms, in 1521, he declared that unless he was convinced from the Word of God, that he was in error, he would not recant. He here threw himself and his cause entirely upon the sacred Scriptures. This was the first open avowal of the grand principle upon which the Reformation of the Church was to be conducted; and this was the point of divergence between Protestantism and Romanism. This great principle constantly crops out in all the conferences, diets and controversies that were held between the Reformers and the Romanists. The Reformers constantly insisted upon the authority of the Scriptures, whilst the Romanists relied

more upon the Fathers, the councils, and the Popes. We intend to show from the writings of the early Reformers, that they never deviated from these principles, but clung to them as long as they lived, and that subscription to confessions of faith was not required of licentiates or pastors in the Lutheran Church, until long after the death of those who may be looked upon as the original Reformers of our Church.

The work of the original Reformers commenced in 1517, and may be said to have ended in 1560, when Melanchthon died. In these forty-three years the ground work was laid, and the glorious superstructure of our Church was reared. As long as Melanchthon lived, the system which had been adopted from the beginning, was maintained in the Church, but after his death, the whole system of Lutheranism was changed, as will appear in the sequel, and, as we think, not for the better, but for the worse. The question may be asked who were the original Reformers? We have gone to some trouble to hunt them up, and we give the following list as the most complete we could gather from the earliest records of the Reformation. We do not pretend to give all, only the more prominent.

Martin Luther, Andrew Bodenstein (Corolstadt) Philip Melanchthon, Justus Jonas, John Bugenhagen, Caspar Creutzer, Nicolas Amsdorf, John Agricola, Conrad Figenbotz, John Draconites, Urban Regius, Gabriel Didymus, George Spalatin, Dyonysius Melander, John Brentius, Andrew Osiander, Vitus Dietrich, Antony Corvinus, Ehrhard Schnepffius, Conrad Otinger, Simon Schneweis, Paulus Rhodius, Gerardus Œniken, Brixius Northanus, Micheal Coelius, Peter Geltnerus, Wendalinus Faber, John Aepinus, Frederick Myconius, John Songius, Ambrosius Blaurerus, John Fontanus, George Heltus, and Bonifacius Wolfartus. There were many others, but these seem to have been the most conspicuous. Some of those unfamiliar names may sound a little harsh to English ears, but to the German ear they are smooth and euphonious especially when they are divested of their Latin terminations. These were the men, who, with Luther at their head,

by their piety, learning and zeal, moved the world, and caused the Pope to tremble on his throne.

These original Reformers must all have been born before the beginning of the sixteenth century, otherwise they would have been too young to take part in the early stages of the Reformation. By the middle of the sixteenth century nearly all the early Reformers had passed away. The men who figured most conspicuously in the Church, after 1550, were all born after the year 1500. Matthias Flacius, who may be looked upon as the founder of the new system of Lutheranism, was born in Istria in 1528; Martin Chemnitz was born in 1525; James J. Andreæ in 1528; Nicolas Selneccer, Andrew Musculus, Christopher Cœrnerus, and the learned Chytræus, were all born after 1517; and of course could not have been among the original Reformers. These were the leaders of the new departure of Lutheranism. Matthias Flacius was the man that started the game of heresy hunting in the Lutheran Church, and yet he was himself one of the greatest heretics in the Church. For in a controversy with one of his fellow Professors at Jena, Prof. Strigelius, he took the absurd position that sin is not an accident, but a substance. This was his own declaration: Peccatum originale esse non accidens sed ipsam substantiam hominis, and it is said he clung to this opinion to the day of his death.

In 1557 this turbulent theologian, who as Mosheim says, "had an uncommon propensity to foment discords," was appointed a Professor of the University of Jena. As Wittenberg, which was at that time under the influence of Melanchthon, was moderate, the University of Jena was started, as the citadel of rigid Lutheranism.

The terms rigid and moderate Lutherans, we find for the first time during the controversies that grew out of the "Interim," which the Emperor Charles V. proposed to the Lutherans in 1548, and this distinction kept up in the Lutheran Church ever since, exists to day, both in Europe and America. As things now look in America, this distinction may exist for many years to come.

When Flacius went to Jena, in 1557, as the defender of

pure Lutheranism, Melanchthon was yet alive, and his influence was still great in the Church, so that his authority kept this turbulent theologian somewhat in check. But when Melanchthon was out of the way, (he died in 1560) and Strigelius and Peucer were in prison, Flacius had everything his own way.

There were during the Reformation period two powerful antagonistic elements at work. These were the authority of the Bible, and the authority of human confessions. Luther and all his co-reformers stood squarely on the one side, whilst the advocates of Romanism stood on the other. As for Luther himself, he not only did not require any subscription to Creed or Confession, but he was opposed to any such thing. His whole life was at open war with the idea of binding the conscience by human confessions. Let us see what he has to say on this point: "Whenever we attempt to put a law upon men that they must believe thus and so, then surely God's Word is not there, if God's Word is not there, it is not certain whether he demands it, for what he has not commanded, we are not sure he would be pleased with. Therefore it is in the highest degree a foolish thing when they say, we must believe the church, the fathers, and the councils, when there is no Word of God for it. They are the apostles of the Devil who give such commands! Therefore in matters which concern the salvation of the soul, nothing but God's Word is to be taught and received." *

Now we may admit that this was aimed at the advocates of Popery, but as Luther was noted for his consistency, may it not also be directed against those in the Lutheran Church who adopt the principles of the Church of Rome?

But it may be asked did not Luther and Melanchthon themselves prepare confessions of faith? Certainly they did, but let us examine into the genesis of these confessions. What were they made for? Take for example, the seventeen articles of Torgau. This was the first co-called confession in the Lutheran Church. How did it originate?

---

* Vide Luther's Works, Walch's Edition, Vol. xviii. p. 394.

In 1529 the Emperor Charles V. was expected in Germany, and it appears he had promised the Elector of Saxony, that he would look into the religious disputes that were then agitating that country. The Elector said, we must have something tangible to lay before the Emperor when he comes, so that he may be able to judge about the matters in dispute. He therefore commanded Luther, with other learned divines, to draw up articles setting forth the principles they believed and taught. These divines met in a conference held at Sultzbach and prepared the Torgau Articles, so called because they were handed to the Elector at Torgau. This Confession is looked upon as the ground work of the Augsburg Confession.

The Schmalcald Articles of 1537, were also prepared by Luther, and were intended to be presented at the General Gouncil that was to have been held at Mantua. This Council was held at Trent in 1546, but Lutheranism had by that time become such a power in the world, that all ideas of a reconciliation with Rome were abandoned.

After the death of Melanchthon, in 1560, backed by the Duke of Weimar and other Lutheran princes, the rigid Lutherans gained the ascendency. The moderate Lutherans were thrown into the back ground, but in the next century they gained what they had lost in this. The Crypto-Calvinistic, and the Synergistic, and other controversies were now in full blast. Luther and Melanchthon, and nearly all the original Reformers were dead, and the Church had fallen into other hands. The Lutherans instead of directing their weapons against Romanism, and sin, turned them upon each other, and against the poor Calvinists. The results were as was to be expected—Rome recovered much of her last power. The heat of controversy ran so high that the tranquility of some of the Lutheran states was threatened. To put an end to these everlasting fightings among the theologians, the civil rulers had to interpose their authority. Hence in 1568 Augustus, Elector of Saxony, and John William, Duke of Saxie Weimar, invited the most eminent Doctors of both parties, *i. e.* the rigid, and the moderate Lutherans, to meet

at Altenberg, and see whether some plan could not be devised to put a stop to these bitter and useless disputes. But little or nothing grew out of this meeting, except more angry controversy. These sturdy old theologians showed clearly to the world that they belonged to the Church militant! After the failure of the Altenberg Conference, matters grew worse and worse. So terrible was the conflict that the Lutheran Princes became alarmed, and saw that something must be done to check these bitter contentions. But the question was what can be done? Hence the Elector Augustus and John William Duke of Saxe Weimar came to the conclusion, (suggested by their court preachers no doubt), to call another conference, and have the learned doctors of the church draw up a form of sound doctrine, and as soon as this "Form of sound Doctrine" should be approved by the several Lutheran governments, or Princes, and adopted by the Lutheran synods, it should be invested with ecclesiastical authority, and that all the controversies in the Church should be decided by this infallible standard. The very conception of this idea was an utter perversion of the principles of pure Lutheranism.

But the idea thus suggested by the Princes was eagerly caught up by the theologians, and carried out to its full extent, as we shall see in the sequel. The man selected to commence this enterprise was James J. Anderæ, Prof. in the University of Tübingen. He was a scholar of the highest repute, and looked upon as a wise, prudent, and cautious man of God. In 1569 he commenced his work. He traveled all over the Lutheran countries of Germany, in order to gather the opinions and sentiments of the different parties in the Church. The Dukes of Würtemburg and Brunswick united with Augustus and John William in this plan for settling the disputes in the Church, so that the getting up of this 'standard of Orthodoxy,' was in reality a political, rather than an ecclesiastical measure. We of course admit that in Germany then, as now, Church and State were inseparably united, and the Church could do nothing but what the State approved. When Andreæ had taken a full and careful survey of the whole field of controversy, he prepared, and pre-

sented to a conference held at Torgau, a well written treatise on the subject of the lamentable divisions that he found in the Church. And he thought his work would certainly heal the divisions, that he looked upon as injurious to the best interests of both Church and State, and especially would it check the progress of Crypto-Calvinism, that was then making inroads in the Lutheran Church. This important document was afterwards known, as the, "Book of Torgau." It must not be comfounded with a series of doctrinal articles drawn up by Luther in 1529, called the Torgau articles.

When this treatise had been carefully examined by a large number of the most eminent preachers of the Church, a select number of the most learned men was appointed by the different Lutheran Governments, to meet at Bergen, a Monastery near Magdeburg, in 1576, in order to revise this Book of Torgau, and if possible to make it acceptable to the whole Lutheran Church. The men who were appointed for this important work, were James J. Andreæ, Martin Chemnitz, Nicholas Selnecer, Andrew Musculus, Christopher Cornerus and David Chytraeus. These were all men of renown, not only in their own age, but in all subsequent ages. For gravity of manners, extensive learning, sound judgment, and true piety, they had no superiors in the Lutheran, or any other Church. The result of their labors was the famous "Form of Concord," which they modestly called, "Formula Concordiæ Epitome, of the controverted articles among the Theologians of the Augsburg Confession." And although there are a few things in this Book that we cannot approve, yet we look upon it as one of the most lucid, satisfactory, and scriptural exhibitions of the great truths of revealed religion ever written by uninspired men. It has no equal.

Much as we admire this able document, and full as it is of God's eternal truth, there are nevertheless a few blotches in it, that might be obliterated without doing it any injury, but greatly increasing its value. This book of Concord seems to have been necessary in that contentious age, to settle the disputes then raging in our Church. And although some of its enemies called it "The Book of Discord" yet it no doubt had

a good and tranquilizing effect on the Church. After its adoption by the greater part of the Lutheran Churches, and states, it was made the standard of Lutheranism, and, in less than a hundred years, it occupied so important a position that it seems to have thrust the Bible and everything else aside. Hence about one hundred years after the adoption of this Confession, Dr. Spener, (whose Lutheranism will not be called into question) says that it was usual for students to spend five or six years at the Universities without hearing, or caring to hear, a single book, chapter or verse of the Bible explained. Carpzov and Olearius undertook to deliver lectures on Greek exegesis, but soon abandoned the thankless task: The Book of Concord was the Lutheran Bible. And this is pretty much the case now with the rigid Lutherans. The Bible was less used in the Lutheran Universities before Spener's time than it had been by the Catholics before the Reformation. The Lutheran Confessions were studiedt with the utmost care and diligence, the minutest distinctions of the symbols were contended for, says Spener, with the the greatest zeal, and the least deviation from them was branded as heresy, and was punished with the greatest severity. It was this deplorable state of things in the Lutheran Church, that called for the founding of a new University at Halle, towards the close of the eighteenth century.

Although Arendt, Spener, and Francke, and the other founders of the school of Pietism in the Lutheran Church, preferred the Lutheran Confessions to those of the Calvinists, yet they did not, like the rigid Lutherans, place them side by side with the Bible. The powerful appeals of Arndt to the Church in behalf of experimental piety seemed to have been drowned in the angry contentions of the polemics. Arndt was a pious, earnest and faithful pastor, rather modest and retired in his habits, not well fitted for a Reformer. Spener was altogether a different man, devotedly pious, but more independent and aggressive. He was a man of extensive learning, and splendid talents, and unquestionably the most effective preacher in the Lutheran Church of that day. His sermons stirred the very heart of Germany. It is said

that a single sermon of his threw the whole city of Frankfort into excitement. After having been driven from one place to another by the rigid Lutherans, he at last found a home in Berlin, and protection under the fostering care of Frederick III., of Brandenburg. He influenced Frederick to found the University of Halle. This was his great life-work. It was his great object to divert the attention of the students from the symbols of the Church to the Scriptures. He wished every student to derive his system of religion from the Bible. Having the selection of the Professors, he appointed Francke, Breithaupt and Anton, all men whose principles accorded with his own. Prof. Deutschmann, of Wittenberg, found no less than two hundred and sixty errors in one of Spener's books, and yet Spener held to the symbols of the Church as well as Deutschmann, and was far more consistent.

Spener had no time to enter into controversies on the nature of the presence of Christ in the sacrament, or on the ubiquity of Christ's body. He saw his countrymen with little of living piety under the preaching of the rigid Lutherans, and determined to do what he could to produce a change. Nor was he the man to be put down by the rigid Lutherans. Entrenched as he was in the affections of his sovereign and his parishioners, he stood up boldly for the truth as it is in Jesus. The school at Halle was establised, not to oppose the symbols of the Church, but to correct the errors and abuses that had grown out of them.

The founders of our Church in this country were imbued with the spirit of Spener and Francke. They were more concerned about a living Christianity in the heart, than a cold dead orthodoxy in the head. And those who are now trying to induce the Lutherans in America to forsake the ways of their pious fathers, and turn over to a rigid symbolism, will most assuredly be disappointed. The Germans and Scandinavians, who have been fed on symbolical pabulum all their lives, will of course go with them. In the beginning of the seventeenth century when the prevailing religion consisted in violent disputes over fanciful theories, and when practical

piety was lost sight of in the greater part of the Church, such symbols may have had their uses. But the world, especially the Protestant world, has become too practical to be satisfied with mere theories. Romanism, High Church Episcopalianism, and rigid Lutheranism, are firm and immovable as the Creeds around which they revolve.

We have nothing to say against the men who made the "Form of Concord." They were good, pious, and learned men. They loved the Church, and labored to promote her best interests. They were careful, too, in defining their views about the paramount claims of the Sacred Scriptures. In their Preface to the "Form of Concord," they say, "We believe, teach and acknowledge that the only rule, and measure, (Ger. Richtschnur) by which all teaching, and teachers are to be judged and decided upon, are the prophetical, and apostolical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as it is written in Psalm 119 : 105, "Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." And Paul says, Gal. 1 : 8, "But though we, or an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." And to make the matter, if possible still more definite and clear, they say "But other writings of ancient or modern teachers, whatever they may be called, shall not be held equal to the Sacred Scriptures, but shall on all occasions be subject to them, and shall not be received otherwise than as witnesses to the Scriptures." Now this is all right. But the successors of these good and sensible men seem to have overlooked this wise precaution, and soon raised the symbols, not only to an equality with the Bible, but above it. This, according to the united testimony of Spener, Francke, Mosheim, Pheiffer, Knapp and many other distinguished Lutherans, was the state of things in the Church during the first half of the seventeenth century. And this is the kind of Symbolism the Lutheran Church in America does not feel disposed to encourage and foster.

Such was the veneration, in the age referred to, for the Symbols of the Lutheran Church, that a kind of semi-inspiration was attributed to those who made them. And it

is no doubt true, that these good men honestly mistook their own interpretations of the Bible, for the Bible itself. They were so sure that they were right, that they never even looked at the interpretation of those who differed from them. Then two or three generations of Lutherans grew up under the same erroneous impressions, *i. e.* that the "Form of Concord" taught just what the Bible taught, hence it was the most natural thing in the world to throw the Bible aside, or to undervalue it, just as the Church of Rome had done. The fact, (stated above) that all the Lutheran Universities had ignored Biblical instructions, is an evidence that the Symbols were more highly prized than the Word of God. And this is not to be wondered at, for the "Form of Concord," and especially the "Visitation Articles" of 1592, make the Lutheran view of the corporeal presence of Christ, in the Holy Supper, much clearer than the teachings of the Bible. A large part of the Protestant Christians of the world do not understand the doctrines of the Lord's Supper, as they are understood by the rigid Lutherans. It is very doubtful whether the Lutheran Church did not lose more than she gained by the adoption of the "Form of Concord." The Lutheran Church as a whole, never did, and never will receive this Symbol. This elaborate Creed, then, never will be, never was, and is not now a bond of union.

The Augsburg Confession is the document under which the Lutheran Church achieved her greatest victories. The grandest triumphs of her moral power was from 1530 to 1570—hence it has always been the conviction of many of her ablest and most devoted sons, that the Augsburg Confession must be the rallying point of our Church. If, as Dr. C. P. Krauth says, "we cannot unite on the Augsburg's Confession, we can never be united on anything else"..... The Dr. never uttered a truer sentiment.

Why cannot the Lutherans of America unite on the Augsburg Confession? Does not that splendid Confession set forth the doctrines that all Lutherans have for three hundred and fifty years believed, and do now believe? Dr. Mosheim (born 1695) in the first half of the seventeenth century stood

high among Lutherans, and was among the most brilliant scholars in the Church, and as well acquainted with her genius and history, as any man that ever lived. He says, "The great and leading principle of the Lutheran Church is, that the Scriptures are the only source from which we are to draw our religious sentiments, whether they relate to faith or practice." To this noble sentiment all true Lutherans can say, AMEN.

ARTICLE IV

HISTORY OF THE HEBREW TRANSLATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

By REV. B. PICK, Ph. D., Rochester, N. Y.

Ours is truly an age of Bible translation. A mere superficial examination of the reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society, cannot but convince even the most skeptical, that the day is not far distant, when every man in his own tongue, wherein he was born, will hear the messengers of the gospel speak the wonderful works of God. In more than 200 languages the word of God is published, and from land to land, and sea to sea. The glad tidings of good things are brought by those who preach the gospel of peace. If we may believe tradition, translation of parts of the New Testament already existed at a very early period. But as there is no certain information concerning such a translation into the languages of the Old Testament Scriptures, the history of this translation can only be traced back to the year 1537, when the Gospel of St. Matthew was published in Hebrew by Sebastian Münster, the *Germanorum Esdras et Strabo*, as he is called upon his tombstone at Basle. Great attention was excited by this book at the time of its appearance, on account of an ancient tradition which prevailed in the Church, that St. Matthew originally wrote his Gospel in Hebrew. It was very evident, however, that Münster's publication, תורת המשיח, had no pretension to be regarded as the text of the sacred original, nor even as an ancient ver-

sion, for the langnage in which it was written was not the Syro-Chaldaic, current in Palestine at the time of our Lord, but the rabbinical Hebrew in use among the Jews of the twelfth century. It was, morever, full of solecisms and barbarisms, and bore indubitable marks of having been translated either directly from the Vulgate, or from an Italian version of the Vulgate. In an apology for this work, dedicated to Henry VIII. of England, Münster states that the MS. from which he printed was defective in several passages, and that he was compelled to supply the omissions as best he could from his own resources. It passed through several editons, and a Hebrew version of the Epistle to the Hebrews was appended to it. Another edition of the same translation of St. Matthew, but printed from a more complete and correct MS., (*recens e Judaeorum penetralibus erutum*) brought for the purpose from Italy, was published by Tillet, Bishop of St. Brieux, at Paris, in 1555 with a Latin version by Mercer, (*ad Vulgatam quoad fieri potuit accomodata.*) The gospel according to St. Mark was translated by Herbst, St. Luke by Petri, who also translated the gospels for every Sunday. Conr. Neander translated the Sunday-epistles, Is. Clajus the gospels for Sunday together with Luther's Catechism and Hymns, as well as the Augsburg Confession, whilst Theod. Fabricius translated the history of the Passion and Resurrection.

A translation of the four Gospels into biblical Hebrew was made by Joannes Baptista Jonas, a converted Jew, and Professor of Hebrew at the University of Rome. He dedicated it to Pope Clement IX., and it was published at Rome in 1668, at the expense of the congregation de Propaganda Fide. But this translation Dr. Delitzsch remarks, fulfilled less than might be expected from a man born at Safet in Upper Galilee, who, besides was a Jewish scholar. The Epistle to the Hebrews was also translated by the convert, F. A. Christiani (Leipzig 1676), which hardly surpasses its predecessors.

The first translation of the entire New Testament into Hebrew was made by Elias Hutter, a Protestant divine, born at

Ulm, in 1553. He was Professor of Hebrew at Leipzig; and first distinguished himself by his ingenious plan of printing a Hebrew Bible, in which he had the radical letters struck off with solid and black, and the servile with hollow and white, types, while the quiescents were executed in smaller characters, and placed above the line; thus exhibiting at a glance the root or elementary principle of each word.* Hutter's success in this undertaking led him to project a Polyglot Bible. He commenced with the New Testament, but found himself utterly at a loss for want of a Hebrew version. He therefore determined upon supplying the deficiency himself, and in the course of one twelvemonth he produced a translation of the New Testament. He then proceeded with his original design, and completed his Polyglot Testament in twelve languages, at Nüremberg, in 1600. This Hebrew version was afterwards detached from the Polyglot, and repeatedly printed. According to the judgment of Prof. Delitzsch, it is of great value and is still worth consulting, because in many places it is very correct. In 1661, it was revised and published in London, 8vo., under the superintendence of William Robertson; but the greater part of this edition was consumed in the fire of London, 1666, so that copies are now rarely to be met with. A *corrected New Testament in Hebrew*, in 12mo., was published in London in 1798 by the Rev. Richard Caddock, B. A., but it proved not to be acceptable to the Jews, for whose benefit it was published, and a new translation became a desideratum.† In the

---

* The writer of this Article has a copy of this Hebrew Bible, which is now rather scarce.

† A very interesting incident connected with this translation, Dr. Buchanan narrated on one occasion, as follows: "I was informed that many years ago one of the Jews translated the New Testament into Hebrew, for the purpose of confuting it, and of repelling the arguments of his neighbors, the Syrian Christians. This manuscript fell into my hands, and is now in the Library of the University of Cambridge. It is in his own writing, and will be of great use in preparing a version of the New Testament in the Hebrew language. It appears to be a faithful translation, as far as it has been examined; but about the end, when we come to the Epistles of St. Paul he seems

meantime, Dr. Buchanan brought from India a translation of the New Testament, executed in Travancore, among the Jews of that country, the translator being a learned rabbi. The MS. was written in the small rabbinical or Jerusalem character; the style is elegant and flowing, and tolerably faithful to the text. Dr. Buchanan deposited the MS. in the University Library at Cambridge, after having been previously translated, by Mr. Yeates of Cambridge, into the square Hebrew character. A copy was presented to the London Society for the conversion of the Jews, and it was at one time thought that it would greatly promote the object of the Society, to print and circulate the production of a Jew, evidently master of his own ancient language.

After much deliberation, however, a more strictly literal translation was still deemed desirable, and accordingly, in 1816, Mr. Frey and other learned Hebraists executed, under the patronage of the Jews Society, a new edition of the New Testament. In 1818, nearly 3500 copies left the Society's press, and this edition was speedily followed by another issue. The British and Foreign Bible Society assisted materially in this work, by purchasing at various times to a large amount. After this version had been in circulation some time, complaints from Hebrew readers in various parts of the world were laid before the Jews' Society Committee, concerning the rendering of certain passages. To insure minute accuracy, the Committee determined on a thorough revision. They consulted some of the most eminent men in Europe, and Professor Gesenius was recommended to them as the first Hebrew scholar of the age. To him, therefore, the version was con-

---

to have lost his temper, being moved, perhaps, by the acute argument of the learned Benjamite, as he calls the Apostle; and he has written a note of execration on his memory. But, behold the providence of God! The translator became himself a convert to Christianity. His own work subdued his unbelief. In the Lion he found sweetness; and he lived and died in the faith of Christ. And now it is a common superstition among the vulgar in that place, that if any Jew shall write the whole of the New Testament with his own hand, he will become a Christian by the influence of the evil spirit."

fided, with the request of a critique upon it, and suggestions as to alterations. Gesenius went carefully through the work as far as the Acts, and likewise through the book of Revelation. Numerous other engagements, however, compelled him to resign the task. The work, together with Gesenius' notes, was then transferred by the Jews' Committee to Dr. Neumann, a converted Hebrew, lecturer on Hebrew at the University of Breslau. Dr. Neumann commenced the work anew, and his revision, when completed, was acknowledged to bear the stamp of diligence, accuracy, zeal, and profound scholarship. The limited funds of the Society, however, prevented the publication of this valuable revision, and thus it remained for sometime in MS. At this very period, the publisher of the Polyglot Bible, (Mr. Bagster,) requiring a Hebrew version of the New Testament for the Polyglot, applied to the Jews' Society for the critical emendations they had been amassing: the important notes of Gesenius and Neumann were in consequence handed to Mr. Bagster, and were incorporated in the new version executed for the Polyglot by Mr. Greenfield, and published in 1831. In comparing this edition of Greenfield with the second of the Jews' Society, published in 1821, the student will easily perceive, that there has not been made a very great progress in the work of translation, and that neither could stand the test of criticism. The Jews' Society resolved, therefore, on a revision of the edition of 1821. A committee, consisting of Dr. M'Caul, the Rev. M. S. Alexander, (afterwards Bishop of Jerusalem), the Rev. J. C. Reichardt and Mr. S. Hoga, (the well known translator of *Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress* into Hebrew), was intrusted with the revision, which was commenced on the 14th of November, 1836, and finished February 8, 1838. The printing was commenced in December, 1837, and was finished in September, 1838. Duly considering and appreciating the labors of their predecessors, they endeavored to conform the Hebrew text as closely as possible to the Greek, following in most dubious cases the reading of the authorized English version; and were much pleased to find that, in very many cases, even the collocation of the Greek words furnished the best and most

elegant collocation of the Hebrew. They diligently consulted the Syriac, Vulgate, German, Dutch, and French versions, but in diffiulties were generally guided by the Syriac. Their desire was, as far as possible, to furnish a literal translation, remembering that it was the word of the living God which they wished to communicate. They arrived at purity of style, but always preferred perspicuity to elegance. When the revision was finished, the manuscript was read through by each person privately, and then by all together, confronting it again with the Greek text. Some alterations were then suggested, and even in the reading of the proof sheets various little amendments were made.* This new edition of 1838, although a great improvement upon the former, proved by no means to be the *ultimatum.* In the year 1856, a new revision of the work was decided upon, and to Mr. Reichardt, together with Dr. Bisenthal, the task of revision was given. The edition of 1838 was carefully examined, and April 12, 1865, the work was completed. In 1866, the new edition with vowels and accents was published, which redounds to the honor of both revisers and the Society. But this edition, in spite of the great amount of labor bestowed and the money spent upon it, proved itself not to be the *ne plus ultra*, especially in view of the criticism concerning the, text as well as the accents, which Prof. Delitzsch published in his Hebrew edition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Considerations like these, especially the desire of realizing a hope cherished for about forty years, induced Prof. Delitzsch to undertake a new version of the New Testament, and we believe that he has executed this task in such a way, that it will stand the severest criticism. Aside from the translators's ability, there is another point, which will make this new translation superior to all its predecessors. All former translations were made from the so-called *textus receptus*, the present from the *Codex Sinaiticus*, and the student, who peruses this translation, will find all such passages as are wanting in the *Codex Sinaiticus* or the *Codex Alexandrinus* put in brackets. The

*Jewish Intelligence, 1838, p. 226.

British and Foreign Bible Society published this new version last year, a copy of which the author has sent to the writer, who takes pleasure in bringing this new work of the well known German Professor to the notice of the Christian student, who can procure a copy for about thirty cents.

ARTICLE V.

OBJECTIONS TO THE CAUSE OF MINISTERIAL EDUCATION CONSIDERED.

By L. M. Heilman, A. M., Harrisburg, Pa.

For some reason, Beneficiary Education has failed to render satisfaction to many minds. It, as a matter of course, has always encountered opposition, just as the cause of Missions and every other good cause; but men, once its friends, seem to have conceived a dislike for the plan. It is unreasonable to expect that it should be free from all imperfection, but surely, maintained as it has been by the wisest and best of men, the objections to it are to some extent imaginary or exaggerated.

There is, however, objection made further back, against a ministry at all liberally educated. This so-called advanced age, along with metaphysical Science, deems theology as old and less tangible than the Physical Sciences; and regarding the ministry as necessarily confined to theology, looks upon preachers as thus necessarily unlearned. They accordingly must be unscientific, and doting upon topics far back from the progress of materialism.

And cries against a thorough training in the schools come from men, who claim that a more fervent zeal alone will awaken souls to their need of the Gospel. The country has been deeply stirred by men of bad grammar and earnest preaching; and many seeming to attribute extraordinary movements to the illiterateness of men, overlook the criticisms and difficulties to which regular and continued pastor-

ates are exposed, and so undue contempt is created for ministers whose pulpits have been favored with the learning and culture acquired by "rubbing against College and Seminary walls."

With even less reason, there are also many, whose sympathies with men and institutions, too often lead them to hasten some into the ministry with meagre attainments. It cannot be denied that this is so in many of our Synods. The generality of men, too, are not so much for the education of the heralds of the Cross, as might be reasonably expected from the advancement of the age. Our high schools, which have advanced in our numerous cities and towns, give just enough of the higher branches of learning to satisfy the curiosity of young men, and few of them ever go to a college, but hasten at once into business, and there become the thinkers and influential men who oppose, if not directly yet indirectly, the need of so much learning. The love of learning is not cherished. Scientists too often regard the ministry as meddling in physics, hasty zeal wants only piety, and various influences lead to undervalue a learned pulpit. In attempting a discussion of this subject, we must be allowed to disclaim any special pretension to the higher attainments advocated. It is proposed to consider some objections to ministerial and beneficiary Education; and we begin with,

OBJECTIONS TO A LIBERAL MINISTERIAL EDUCATION.

1. The first is the general summary of the above tendencies,—the *utilitarian plea*—just enough for our special work. All men, even preachers, must be *specialists* in their peculiar way. This old complaint is forever varnished up anew. It is a thoughtless, silly objection; for it does not comprehend the *principle of training*, as the grand object of learning. It does not follow that a man, because he studies them, must preach the myths of Homer, and the storms of Virgil, any more than expound the differential tables of Pascal; but that the mind may gain culture and self-control. The apostles of Christ did not need three years to learn that their Master could perform miracles, or the same length of time to

understand His teachings, for a single pentecostal hour taught them more; but they gained a culture in that best of schools with that best of teachers. Why was Paul left to pass through Tarsus and Jerusalem, in the curriculum of the two greatest schools of Gentiles and Jews, before his conversion, when he in a rapture learned more of the Gospel than in the years of study, if it was not to give him that consecutively trained mind, that made his work the superior of all the apostles? It is the Divine plan, to draw out a man by training him to get his knowledge for himself. God never gives revelations when men can find out by working for themselves. The Pharisees had no visions of the Babe of Bethlehem; but the Shepherds and Magi had, for the latter had no other method of knowing.

2. This general complaint of utilitarianism troubles its voice with the special one of "secularizing the clergy." But alas, this is the whine of fifteen hundred years at least. It is as unjust as antique. Such an educated Christianity has sanctified learning, and turned the revelations of nature to praise God, in unison with the praise called forth by His word. The ministry study science to see the beauty and order of creation, and there find that the nature and attributes of God are displayed in the material universe. It does not make a believer in a Divine revelation skeptical, to find such convincing proofs of the divine existence and agency, but must greatly confirm his faith.

It is difficult to see how we could explain the long previous culture of St. Paul, if it be not that he was by it led to to meet the foes of Christ in his day. It was of the most important service to him, when he could meet the Jews and philosophers on their own ground, and refute their cavils and objections. He could stand on the platform which had been graced by Demosthenes, and speak with power that awed the critical Athenians. His knowledge was inappropriate and his eloquence sinful, if, perchance, he was mad with learning! No, the testimony of history is, that the world's greatest men are found among the advocates of the Gospel. In every age the most successful laborers in the cause of Christ

and His truth, were men of superior training. Origen, "the father of Scientific Theology," was distinguished among all classes for his learning. The brilliant lights of Tertullian and Chrysostom had shone at the bar and on the rostrum with extraordinary splendor, before their conversion. Classical and scientific training not only fits men for their calling in the ministry, but these attainments are sanctified and turned to noblest purposes. While schools existed for theological training, from the earliest periods, Providence, as if regarding their curriculum too meagre, seized in those ages the most distinguished scholars from other spheres, that their learning might be used against the skepticism then prevailing. And as soon as the fanatical cry of secularizing the ministry led the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, to discourage the education of candidates for the sacred office, there set in those thousand years of darkness which an inefficient clergy left to reign. It was only when the voice of a learned ministry was heard, that reformation began, and new life was restored to the Church.

3. The objection to "*theological controversy*," as caused by learning, is still urged as of old. It is repeated with zest, that the more learned of our Doctors are ever bringing strife and contention into the Church. We are not prepared to say that learned men have not sometimes been given to controversy, but we repel as not true the charge that learning makes men contentious. Controversy may sometimes be necessary. It has aided in settling the most sublime doctrines of the Bible. Besides, it has quickened inquiry, stimulated talent, and prompted to activity, and this has given men that superiority which nothing but earnest search after the truth can bestow. When the age of disputes about creeds, which we are willing to call overwrought, was passed through, the clergy became less earnest and persevering as students of divine things, and less original as thinkers. Angelo drew his inimitable pictures with brushes made by his own hand. Original inquiry makes men. So it is that earnest study has made most active and useful ministers. Controversy is the weakness, not the result of learning.

Controversies, it may be said, are sought by learned men, for the purpose of displaying their talents or learning, who thus become proud and unfitted for the work of an earnest ministry. We admit that there is danger here. Some men acquire learning and literary skill as a miser does his gold, for the mere love of it; but it does not necessarily follow that either gold or learning is hurtful or sinful. And as for the pride of learning, it is certain that neither the trained nor untrained pastor has any reason to boast of his superior attainments, and it is equally certain, that scholarly attainments do not unfit men for piety or the hard work of the ministry. There is greater danger to be apprehended from the conceit and mock humility, that often allow a novice to assume that for which the Scriptures require "reading" and "aptness to teach." The accurate scholarship of Doddridge was consistent with the profoundest spirituality. Melanchthon's learning and humility are proverbial. The extensive authorship of Baxter did not unfit him for the most laborious service in the pulpit, and from house to house.

4. With the risk of incurring blame for prolixity, we must not forget the objection that *too much time* is spent in preparation. Souls, it is said, perish meanwhile. And the difficulty is aggravated, as supposed, in so long detaining the beneficiary whose expenses are borne by the Church. A word should suffice upon this point, which the more and more prevalent practice of various denominations is regarding as an unfounded objection. Providence detains the child and youth many years, training and fitting him for life, even though a widowed mother's poverty impatiently argues, she must wait long. Is it true that, on this account, "souls perish?" Does it prove a wrong that the physician is not hastened out to aid the sick and suffering, before he has acquired that knowledge and experience which will enable him to act intelligently and render valuable assistance? Shall he experiment on men's diseases and wounds, before he has qualified himself for the task? Time thus employed is not lost, but gained. The class-room fits the young man with elements, at least, of what is most important to his future usefulness and

efficiency. Experience testifies from the lips of many, that in the active field time can never make up for the loss of a quiet and complete preparatory training.

Over and above all these complaints, we cannot fail to see, in the times, the banner of sacred learning floating over the learned world. The confident materialist has had his proud boasting lowered in tone. A few years ago, men prophesied that materialistic infidelity was about to drive the Church from civilized lands, to cultivate only the darker regions. But what do we see? The learning of the believing Church is in the breach, and the foremost scientists of the day, as Virchow, Dana, and Gray, lift the white flag, and caution their specialist friends not to *assume* so much. Spencer and Huxley have considerably modified their tone, and Darwin has well nigh retracted; and if Tyndall is still bold, it is against the decided caution of the calmer and more reasonable scholars, and because he cannot rid his irate blood of the "theological" venom he imagines he already drank. The tide has turned, and the battle is being decided in favor of truth, for which much has been done by Christian if not clerical learning. To say the least, some of the most efficient scholarship on the side to which the tide is tending, would not have been in the conflict, were the ministry trained on the utilitarian plan, or kept ignorant of the magazines of science, or had they been afraid or unable to enter the field of combat. There has been many a Paul on Mar's Hill.

OBJECTIONS TO BENEFICIARY EDUCATION.

There is real dissatisfaction on the part of many, with the support of students by the Church, while in College and Seminary preparing for the ministry.

1. Failures are supposed to be so many, as to justify the objection to the whole practice as a failure. Some beneficiaries have taken only a partial course, and are in the field not sufficiently prepared. Others have cut their studies short, or taken the collegiate course and gone into the ranks of other professions. It has been the means of putting men wanting in talent or consecration, or both, into the ministry. The

health of some has compelled them to desist from the work, and death, in some cases, has caused money to be lost. These are mostly serious charges. But it may be said, that amid the uncertainties of life, there is hardly an investment of business or benevolence of any kind, where such failures are not more or less common. Many a father has the same experience with a child or a family. The question cannot be determined upon the cases of failure, unless these cases are the *prevailing* ones. This we cannot admit.

As to the character of the subjects, physically, intellectually, and morally, many false impressions exist, and these impressions, in many cases, arise just because of the common tendency of men to find fault with poverty, and especially with those who are dependent for support upon others. The gold in the coffer of a rich man hides a multitude of sins in his son. The stigma of "poor" young men at school, "charity students," "beneficiaries of the Church's money," and the like, readily foster the vague prejudice against sober judgment. These are in their centre false impressions. These beneficiaries are not from the lowest classes of society. It has been observed by Bernard, that they are from the laboring class of society, who fill really the positions of honor and trust in state, the useful trades, and ranks of royal merchants. This competent judge calls them, in his American Journal of Education, "*picked men.*" An occasional gawky, who thus gets to be a member of a College, very readily creates in the minds of some for life a dislike to the whole system. President Woolsey, 1864, gave it as his judgment, after careful observation and inquiry, that by far the majority of beneficiaries under his care stood in rank above the average scholarship.

Some failures with the Presbyterian Board of Education, a few years ago, were attributed to discouragement of beneficiaries, by giving them too little aid. The most common observation discovers, that some of our students have boarded themselves, for lack of sufficient aid, and have laid the foundation for unsocial temperament, and disease, and have actually met death prematurely, while at College or Seminary.

The discovery also is not hard to make, that committees and Synods inquire insinuatingly about these "beneficiaries," often to the painful injury of sensitive and noble natures. It might be a profitable inquiry, how much the fault-finders have actually done to bring about the objects of their complaints publicly and privately. And as for those not really designed for the gospel ministry, there are quite as many on their own funds that make the same mistake. The probability is that not many will undertake a course of eight or ten years' study just because they may get the money. There is nothing in the sober moral and spiritual requirements, even in youth, to lure on the careless to enter so easily the ministerial profession.

But the general usefulness of the system of Beneficiary Education, except for cavilling, ought to foreclose all such discussion. The Church could not have done without the men thus educated. Dr. Alexander once said, that one half of the Presbyterian ministry, trained at Princeton up to that day, had been beneficiaries. Not long since, this proportion was reported officially to be still true to the Church. Within the half century of the General Synod's existence, several thousand young men have been educated by her means. What would have been the sad results, had this means of providing ministers for our Lutheran Church been entirely neglected? Carefully conducted, this method makes the firmest adherents to the cause of Christ. The success that, under various names, has crowned the American ministry, during the period when this agency has been employed, abundantly testifies to the inspiring gratitude and constraining love, which have animated those once so supported. And we very much question whether such men as often leave their own church as others do. They become warmly attached to their denomination and brethren. Beyond all question, many of them occupy and have occupied the most useful and responsible positions in the Church, and have rendered the cause of the Master, even in single cases, more than a return for all the aid bestowed on the cause.

2. The manhood is said to be marred by this method of

support. A young man gains more "grit" and self-reliance by being made to sustain himself. It may not be amiss to bear in mind, that the chief source of this objection is the humanitarian kind of thought, so well known as "New England" thought. It is really of that stamp that makes all of the culture and noble spirit, with which a man may adorn himself, independent of the Spirit of God, and so make himself equal to the Son, whom we prefer to call Divine. Is any man independent? Especially is the young man the author of the fortune that sustains him at school? It is older even than the observation of Channing, that few of the young men, capable of self-support, have the pluck to take a manly course at school or in life. Facts are not in accord with the objector, who theorizes about the unmanning influences of beneficiary aid. The truly humble man does not feel degraded by assistance received, but grateful and encouraged. The American Education Society, for a number of years, *loaned* money to the indigent young men, but seems to have so overburdened them as to have deemed it advisable to give them the money. The supposed manhood was not attainded by this process, but discouraged to failure too often. The practices in other ranks of life do not reveal failure from beneficiary assistance. Charlemagne, whose empire was regarded as the most successful of Roman experiments in government during the dark periods, found it well to educate the youth upon the public bounties. Buddhism and Mohammedanism do not have any less acute defenders of their causes, because they rear their champion teachers in mosque and temple. It ought not to blunt the feelings of a young man about to enter the ministry, that he is aided, any more than those entering the ranks of cadets at West Point. In Europe, where manly scholarship has found a place, the schools are none the less high in their standard for having many of the teachers and scholars trained by the public funds. Say if you will, that at West Point and military schools in Europe, all, without distinction, are sustained. We point to distinctions that are made, between the rich and the poor, in the seminaries of teachers and students, in universi-

ties, even for political and other positions. Facts stamp the objection as a myth.

3. The same spirit, supposing itself an advocate of manly independence, thinks that Beneficiary Education is a fetter to talent and free inquiry, because the student is required to enter the ministry, and of the denomination that aids him. Some years ago it was maintained, in the *Evangelical Review*, that money ought be given without exacting the promise of the study of theology. It is reiterated that beneficiaries are compelled to simply learn dogmas as formulated by others, that the scriptures are learned only as the schools teach them, and that all free independent acquirements of truth are narrowed to parrot knowledge.

That some students are deficient in independence of thought, is not denied, but that only beneficiaries are so, and because they are beneficiaries, is without proof. Are those aided more narrow-minded than others? As for contracting the development of the mind, there is more of gratuity and theory than careful observation in that objection. Positive knowledge is always more inspiring and quickening than the flimsy doubts, that too many self-styled free inquirers throw about not only the points of indifference, but around fundamental truths. It is the boast of the Unitarian and Universalist. When the second century bent the theological student to meet the skepticism and idolatry of that day, was there not more vigor in the ministry than when training was more indifferent? Did Revs. Cotton and Mather preach less faithfully the gospel for having been beneficiaries? Let the liberal thinkers ask, did the several millions of money expended by the American Education Society, in its first half century, make its thousands of beneficiaries less effective or more narrow Congregationalists? The system has rather elevated the standard of learning and ministerial attainments in all denominations, for without it, many unlearned would have filled their pulpits. Indeed, with the present methods of instruction, and the full comparison of theological views in the history of doctrine, it is impossible to understand how a student can fail to see nearly all kinds of opinions. And if any would see what comes of much preach-

ing without proper training, they need only look at the extensive antinomian tendencies of the gospel preached without the law, in these latter years. Multitudes have gone to inquiry meetings, and temperance gatherings, with apparent peace with God, who were ignorant of the duty of obedience. Are we not reaping the reaction of this preaching of faith without works? We tremble at the course of Oxford, twenty-five and fifty years ago, when she sent out the most ingenious skeptics on the one hand, and superstitious ritualists on the other, because she left her sons without the proper knowledge of Christian Evidences, and of saving evangelical truths. To sum up the whole danger of a free and undetermined course for students, what have Yale and Harvard done for truth and Christ, since they left the original basis of ministerial education? Let much of New England skepticism answer.

4. Once more, it is objected that this system puts too many men into the ministry. Beneficiary Education multiplies ministers! Does it call men? God does that. The men needed are raised up. The Lord develops his kingdom as He does the tree. The vine produces the branches, and Christ has so called the agents needed. Dispensations followed each other, providences, offices, teachings, as men could bear them. When the world is ripened for reformation the reformer is raised up. In the individual history of Christ's ministers, the smallest circumstances of childhood and youth are significant of their calling. The men are called in Divine providence, and the simple duty is too fit them. Too many there cannot be, while the prayer for "more laborers" is not obsolete. The proportions of labor and number of laborers are not in men to regulate. If there be only more of the spirit of self-denial in the Church, there will not fail to be found fields. The domestic and foreign fields are not reaped; and the commanded prayer is for more laborers. Let more missionary money be raised, and instead of pastors driving themseves from their charges by it, they will send other men away to other fields. The proportions of demand and supply are only disarranged in time of spiritual panic.

Will any man undertake to prove that the ministry, sent out under beneficiary training, is not Divinely called? Luther and Muhlenberg entered fields in pursuance unquestionably of the Divine will, but they were largely beneficiaries. The men whose names are enrolled high in the annals of the Church on both continents, cannot be regarded as intruders into the sacred office. Imagine the irretrievable loss to the American churches without these men, and then consider the duty incumbent in the Church towards this cause.

Besides considering the objections to this work, we will mention some of

THE DISADVANTAGES OF ABANDONING BENEFICIARY EDUCATION.

1. To abandon the system is to have an uneducated ministry. The men called of God would, without training, largely enter their fields. As a rule it has not been so, because when men were wanting, for instance in the new world, educated beneficiaries, or others, were raised up in the old. Had this plan not prepared a considerable number, the western continent would not have had such able missionaries. This method alone has given a sufficiency of trained men to preserve an educated ministry. And once put a large number of untrained men into the office, and the standard of culture throughout the Church is lowered. Beneficiary Education helps to unlock the treasures of science and learning, and to furnish an able and competent ministry for our day and generation.

2. To abandon this, is to abandon one of the noblest investments of benevolence. The vine dresser takes pains with the vine long before it produces the luscious fruit. Candidates for the ministry need care and pecuniary aid during the preparation, if they are to yield the richest fruits for the Church. They can no more support themselves during their student course, than afterwards in the field. Yet they are called and as really are doing service while preparing for the blessed kingdom, as at any other time. The aid then bestowed is expended on direct training of mind and heart. Other causes of benevolence receive very largely for material and

bodily wants, while this trains talent, and that to fit it for the noblest agency in the mind of God. The value of such an investment is not to be estimated.

3. To abandon Beneficiary Education, is to ignore the voice of history and the examples of Scripture.

Those whom God has raised up to herald the truth, have usually been poor in temporal goods. The Old Testament and the New are our testimony. One cannot but feel that opposition to this cause is opposition to the teachings of providence and inspiration. The Apostles ate the bread of miracles and of the families that entertained them, while under the tuition of their Master. Timothy was a traveling beneficiary. Paul in Arabia could hardly have supported himself during three years of study. In the early Church the plan was not unknown, since Polycarp was supported by money from a Christian lady during his course under his apostolic preceptor. And when we turn to the Old Testament we find the same practice. The schools of the prophets were beneficiary, else the care for the poisoned pottage and the sunken axe has little meaning. Gehazzi asked money and raiment for the student prophets. Samuel was reared from a child at the altar of beneficence. And indeed the whole Levitic tribe were reared and supported by the other tribes. So nearly universal is this method in the Bible, that it is just to call the scriptural plan of training ministers, *beneficiary*, and to charge those who oppose it with setting themselves against a divinely sanctioned method of educating the needy young men, whom God has called to further His cause, by preaching the Gospel.

It may be added, that some of the difficulties and failures of this system arise from mistakes in not exercising proper discrimination in the selection of candidates. There should be opportunity to examine carefully into the talents and qualifications of the applicants.

1. The method of Scripture points usually to those of susceptible years.

2. Synods should require sufficient proof on the part of young men of Christian character, and of energy and ability

to study, and this from other than partial friends. Careful investigation should be made, in each case, before the applicant is received by the Church.

With some such cautions, the Church needs awakening to her duty in this work. This interest should lie nearer her heart, and more should be done to supply laborers for the ever-widening field. The work of God will extend, and the agents must be increased and equipped. This is clear. God calls: and the Church must educate.

ARTICLE V.

COURSE AND CHARACTER OF EMIGRATION, AND WHAT PER CENT. IS AVAILABLE TO THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.*

By Rev. Prof. Samuel Aughey, Ph. D., Lincoln, Nebraska.

This subject involves the presentation of statistics, and has so far a basis of fact. Correct statistics are among the most important of all factors in the calculations of the statesman, and even the plans of the teacher and moralist. It has been observed that the correctness of a nation's statistics gauges the perfection of her science of government. For government to be worthy of the name must be scientific. Plato remarked, (Statesman): "that can be the only true form of government, in which the governors are found to possess true science, and are not mere pretenders, whether they rule according to law, or without law, over willing or unwilling subjects and are rich or poor." And no government can be scientific that does not ground her works on the statistics of the nation, as well as the character of the people. The social philosopher is equally dependent on statistics for the determination of some of those problems, that lie in the path of his investigations.† Now, the church will act most wisely if she heeds

*An address delivered before the Home Missionary Convention of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church at Omaha, Neb., May 15th, 1878.

†See Carey's Social Science, Vol. II.—also Spencer and Mill.

the lesson from the same source. This would be the course of wisdom, the dictum of science, and obedience to the very requirements of the gospel.

It is true that the statistics of the Republic do not compare in accuracy with those, for example, of Germany. The great German statisticians can tell, within a very small fraction, how many romantic young ladies of sixty will, during the next years, marry boys of eighteen; and how many masculine fools of sixty will marry girls of eighteen. They can also tell how many cases of desertion there will be next year, what per cent. will die from each kind of disease, and how many will commit suicide by hanging, shooting, poison, etc. In view of this accuracy of their statistics, their great statistician asks, "is society therefore a machine, destined to move in a rut, whatever the human will may devise." He answers this question himself, by no means, because statistics give the causes of misfortune and crime, and it is the business of the statesman, the teacher and church, to remove the causes, when the effect must cease. Now while it is true that our statistics are not correct enough to give results with entire accuracy they still approximate close enough to the truth, to point out the path of duty, and the conditioning law, obedience to which will lift the Church into new life and the fulfillment of her true destiny.

The causes of emigration vary with the age and country. At present the great impelling motive of the people, who emigrate into new lands, is the craving to better their financial condition. Sometimes indeed there may be social or sanitary reasons that prompt to a change. Occasionally men throw themselves into the whirl of western life to escape from trouble. Not a few come here with the laduable ambition to help to make and to mould aright new commonwealths. But after making full allowance for every other motive, none will be found so common or potent as the desire to do better financially, and especially to give children a better start in the race of life. And in this respect, there is

---

*Zur Philosophie der Statistik, G. Fr. Kalb, Leipzic, 1875.

little difference between natives and foreigners. The number who come to the west from abroad, like the German Russians, from religious considerations, is a small per cent. of the whole number. As might be expected, the great body of those who come west are comparatively poor. Often they are only able to get a piece of raw prairie, "on time," and until their land, however cheap it may be, is paid for, brought into cultivtion, buildings, stock, and machinery provided for, little can be done or given for church purposes.

No State has furnished more people for the west than Pennsylvania. Early occupied by the hardy Germans, it has never ceased to supply other States, and especially those in the same latitude, with a superior class of emigrants. Ohio very early drew most largely on Pennsylvania for its people. Indiana and Illinois obtained almost as many. Pennsylvania largely helped to swell the population of Iowa. And it should not be forgotten that many of the emigrants that are credited to Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, in the census reports of Nebraska, originally came from Pennsylvania, and are really of Lutheran origin and character.

According to the census of 1870, about six per cent. of the people of Nebraska came from Pennsylvania. As the population of Nebraska, long before the close of this year, will be 400,000, and as this proportion of emigration from Pennsylvania has rather increased since 1870, we are safe in saying, that during this year, there will already be at least 24,000 people here from the old Keystone State. As at least twenty per cent. of the population of Pennsylvania is Lutheran, at least that per cent. of the people coming here from there must be Lutheran. This would give a Lutheran population for Nebraska from Pennsylvania of 4,800. Judging from my experience and observations in traveling over the State, I have no doubt this estimate is too low, but it is better to take the figures of the census reports as the basis for our calculations. About nine per cent. of the population of Nebraska, according to the census tables, comes from Ohio. During this year, therefore, there will have acumulated 36,000 people here from that State. And as a trifle more than ten per cent. of the

population of Ohio are Lutherans, at least that per cent. of the people from Ohio are Lutherans or of Lutheran origin. This would give Nebraska 3600 of a Lutheran population from this State. By the same methods of calculation, I estimate that there are in Nebraska at least 400 of our population from New York, of Lutheran origin. And although no note was taken in the census tables of the number of people in Nebraska from Maryland, yet, from private sources of information, I am satisfied that at least as many Lutherans are here from that State as from New York. It is safe to make the census reports of 1870, the basis of our estimates of the number of people that came here since then, from Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa. From these States, as well as from West Virginia, Missouri, Wisconsin and Michigan, many Lutherans came to Nebraska, and mingled with the population. Not less than 2200 of the population from these States must be of Lutheran origin. It is probably much larger than this. From all these sources, the population here of American origin and Lutheran in membership, birth or affinity, is not less than 11,000. One source of the Lutheran population of Nebraska I find it impossible to estimate in figures. Great numbers of Lutherans of German origin, but American birth, have come here from Wisconsin, a few from Minnesota, Illinois, and Michigan, and a great many from Missouri, of which no notice is taken in the census reports, except the few that are noted as being born in some of these States. Judging, however, from my personal acquaintance with many Germans from these sections, I have no doubt that, by the end of this year, the Lutheran population from these sources will approximate to 5000 souls.

THE NATIVE GERMANS.

As to the Germans of European birth, the case stands very differently. According to the census of 1870, the per cent. of European Germans in Nebraska was about nine. This would give by the end of this year, if the increase has continued at an equal ratio—and it certainly has not lessened—at least

36,000 of a European German population for Nebraska. I do not know the per cent. of Lutherans among these Germans, with any approach to strict accuracy, but after having in places mingled among these Germans somewhat extensively betimes, for thirteen years, I estimate that at least sixty-five per cent. are Lutherans by birth and education. None of the prominent Germans with whom I have conversed on the subject, have made the estimate any lower—the most of them, indeed, have made it higher. This then would give a European German Lutheran population, by the end of this year, of at least 23,760. But if we take into consideration the fact, that there has been an especially large influx of Germans into the State since 1870, this number should be increased to at least 25,000.

SCANDINAVIANS.

Another conspicuous element in the Lutheran population of foreign origin in Nebraska, are the Scandinavians. In 1870, not less than 3.24 per cent. of the population was of Scandinavian origin. Since then, there has been a large increase of emigrants from this source, so that at least four per cent. of the population is now Scandinavian. If this is correct—and there can be no doubt that it is approximately accurate—then the entire number will be 16,000, and all these people can legitimately be considered as Lutheran.

Reviewing now our calculations, we find that the Lutheran population of Nebraska is divided into native and foreign elements. Of American origin, 4800 came from Pennsylvania, 3600 came from Ohio, 400 came from New York, 2200 came from Maryland, New Jersey, Indiana, Illinois, etc. This gives a Lutheran population of 11,000 of American origin. To these add 25,000 Germans, and 16,000 Scandinavians, and we have 52,000 people in Nebraska of really Lutheran ecclesiastical origin—of Lutheran birth and affinity—that ought to be embraced in our churches. I say they ought to be gathered into our churches, for their sake, and for the sake of the Lutheran Church itself. Because here on the plains of Nebraska, will eventually occur some of the great struggles

of the age, between truth and error—between liberty and anarchy, order and law.

Look for a moment at the character of Nebraska. It has been the least advertised of any of the western States, and yet her population will soon be 400,000. Three fourths of her surface is composed of one of the richest soils in the world—the *Loess* formation—a soil that in Egypt and northern China supports a population of from 200 to 500 to the square mile—a soil that has made the Rhine valley and the plains of Burgundy famous for 2,000 years—a soil that is practically inexhaustible, and which can endure the mutations of time better than any other. Here too is a climate which is not surpassed for healthfulness by any section of the globe.*

Here on these plains, long before the close of this century, will be collected a population of 2,000,000, or more, and owing to the educational operations now in progress, these people will be highly educated and accomplished. At the present rate of increase, the Lutheran population by this time ought to number at least one quarter of a million, and it would undoubtedly approach these numbers if the Church could now be brought up to the strict standard of duty. That would be our numerical strength if we merely held our own. But a church, as every one knows, that does its entire duty to its own household, gathers into its fold many, who had never been indentified with Christanity or religion in any form.

LUTHERANISM IN THE ADJOINING STATES.

As to Kansas, Iowa, and Missouri, I will leave the brethren from these magnificent States to speak for themselves. But in studying the census tables, and comparing them with our church statistics, the conclusion has been forced upon me, that there must have been fully as large a per cent. of Lutheran material in each of these States, originally at least, as in Nebraska. If, then, this is correct, estimating the present population of Kansas at 800,000, there ought to be now, or

---

*Those interested on this subject, will find it discussed fully in my paper on the Superficial Deposit of Neb., Hayden Reports for 1874.

there has been at one time and another, a Lutheran population in that State of 102,000 German and English. In Iowa there has been, up to the present time, a Lutheran population of at least 130,000. Probably in Kansas a great deal of our material is already lost to the Church, and there can be no doubt that this is largely the case in Iowa. But concerning Lutheran interests in these States, I am not so well posted, and therefore do not wish to speak so confidently as of Nebraska, which has been the principal scene of my own labors.

WHERE MISSIONARY EFFORTS SHOULD BE PUT FORTH.

There is one feature of missionary work that statistics make doubly emphatic. They unerringly point out where the most hopeful fields of exertion are. They point out where population is increasing most rapidly, and where society is in a formative stage. They demonstrate, beyond all cavil, that the great and most promising fields of missionary work for our Church, are in the new west. Population in the east is comparatively fixed, and the per cent. of increase each decade is comparatively small. Here the population multiplies itself with amazing rapidity. Examine the States west of Pennsylvania, and it will be found that the increase of population has always been vastly the greatest during the extreme youth of the States.

Ohio, for example, increased 105.53 per cent. in population between 1810 and 1820. Already between 1840 and 1850 her increase was only 30.26 per cent., and from 1850 to 1860 her increase was only 18.13 per cent., and during the next ten years it was still less, being only 13.92 per cent. Illinois increased her population, between 1840 and 1850, to the extent of 202.44 per cent., and between 1850 and 1860 78.80 per cent. In the next decade—between 1860 and 1870, her increase of population was only 48.20 per cent. And at the present time, her increase of population comes principally from births, and very little from emigration. In Iowa the largest per cent. of increase occurred between 1840 and 1850, when it reached 345.84 per cent. In the next decade—the one between 1850 and 1860, her increase was still enor-

mous, being no less than 251.12 per cent. But between 1860 and 1870, her increase in population fell to 76.91 per cent. And judging from such imperfect census reports as I have been able to gather, the present decade will not show more than about 45 per cent. of increase.

A great increase in the population of Kansas occurred between 1860 and 1870, when it reached 239.90 per cent. But the present rate of increase is even greater than that. Estimating the population of Kansas at present at 800,000, the increase during the eight years of this decade is not less than 218.80 per cent.. It is more rapid this season than ever before.

In Nebraska the increase of population was 326.45 per cent. between 1860 and 1870. For the eight years of this decade it will not be less than 226.03 per cent. The increase in population was never so rapid as at present.

Neighboring sections — Dakota Territory and Colorado, equally promising to the Lutheran Church, if they could be cultivated, are also increasing in population and wealth with great rapidity, but my limits will not permit me to discuss them.

It is seen from this exhibit, that Nebraska and Kansas are increasing to-day in population at a rate that equals that of Illinois and Iowa, in their palmiest periods. Because our church interests were comparatively neglected in Illinois and Iowa in their formative periods, thirty years ago, when their populations were increasing the most rapidly, so much ground was lost, that it perhaps can never be recovered again, simply because, by our neglect, our own material was gathered into other churches. When I say that our church work was then neglected, I do not mean that nothing was done. I know that men labored there at that time, in the interests of Lutheran Christianity, with an apostolic fidelity. I only mean that there were not enough laborers to occupy the field, and that, therefore, the greater part of our material was gathered by others. If men and means had been sent there in sufficient numbers, during those early days, the Lutheran Church in Illinois at present, in efficiency and numbers, would be second to no other.

The opportunity that the Lutheran Church had in Illinois and Iowa thirty years ago, is, at least to some extent, ours to-day in Nebraska. Even here a great deal has already been lost. But if our work is even now strengthened, as it could and should be, the Church of the Reformation will yet become in this State what she was intended to be by her Master—a great evangelizer of the people, and a leader in every good work.

In view of all these facts, is not this the place where most of our missionary work should be attempted at the present time? Here the most can be accomplished with the same outlay in men and money. There are many single missions in the east, that have cost the Church more in money than all the missions put together, that have become self-sustaining in Nebraska. Supply Nebraska and Kansas each with fifteen more home missionaries, and keep that number in the field, and in ten or fifteen years all this vast territory, so far as Lutheran interests are concerned, will take care of itself. Such a policy would make these dominantly Lutheran States, and give to the Church of the Reformation a vantage ground in the west, such a base of operations and supplies as she possesses in Ohio and Pennsylvania.

It is a well-known maxim in war, that the strongest legions should be precipitated on some point that must be carried at all hazards. The great general guards against scattering his forces, to avoid being cut up in detail. A similar policy in church affairs, would be most in accordance with common sense and the experience of the past. Our missionary work should be massed where the most abundant and available materials are found; where our missionaries can commence work on equal terms with others, and where the most can be accomplished for the Master and the good of men. I am aware that men differ in opinion as to the most desirable localities for missionary effort. But if places are found where the population is rapidly doubling itself by emigration, where our material can be speedily gathered before it is absorbed by others, and where our missionaries can enter the field on equal terms with others—such fields, it is admitted, should

be occupied at once. Now this is precisely the character of the mission fields in Nebraska and Kansas. They can now be occupied with comparatively little cost—hereafter it may be impossible, or they must be cultivated at double the expense in time, labor, and money. Our experience here in Nebraska demonstrates this, that a thousand dollars judiciously expended will accomplish more in developing the resources of our Church, and augmenting its power to reach the masses, than five times that amount expended in older sections, where our interests have been neglected until our members are discouraged and gathered into other folds, and where other denominations have so occupied the ground, that the people spontaneously gravitate towards them.

In Nebraska a few churches have been established by the General Synod, that have done well, perhaps beyond what could naturally have been expected, considering the help that was given them. Still more churches have been organized by the Missouri Synod, most of whose ministers, that I have met, are laboring with great zeal and self denial to gather the scattered members of the fold. And I admit that I greatly prefer that the German Lutherans should be gathered into congregations by the Missourians, rather than see them lost to the church. Among the Scandinavians, both the Augustana and Ansgari Synods have established churches, and supplied them with pastors, who amid poverty and great trials are yet most successful in their work. And yet large fields are comparatively uncultivated. Some of these unoccupied fields may not be promising at first, but faithful labor would soon make them so. A single missionary in a county could often organize a number of congregations of from ten to thirty members, which would become nuclei around which, with faithful labor, would gather many of our members that are coming from the east. In a few years such small beginnings result in self-sustaining pastoral charges.

I say nothing here of the duty of the Lutheran Church to those without any religious home or life. If even there were no Lutherans in the west, the Master's last command would still be imperative to his Church, to send the gospel

and press its claims on the people of these new and growing States.

It has sometimes been charged, that one hindrance to the success of our church in the west, has resulted from the inferior intellectual, moral, and social character of our preachers. This is a misapprehension. I have had unusual opportunities for observation, not only of ours, but also of the clergy of other churches. While on scientific expeditions through the State, which brought me into contact with clergymen in every county, and sometimes in almost every township of Nebraska, and to some extent in Iowa and Kansas, the character of the clergy always attracted my attention. As a result of my observation, I say it without fear of successful contradiction, the Lutheran clergy of the west, in all the elements of a true manhood, in intellectual power, and devotion to their proper work, are the peers of the ministry of any other Church. Nay, further, they even average higher in capacity and character than most other Churches. I admit that some of our ministers are not up to the average in culture; but the same can be said of others. It is also objected that some of our clergy have engaged in secular pursuits. This is true of our ministers and those of all other Churches. Even the east is not without secularized clergymen in almost every large town and city. And it should not be forgotten, that in the great majority of cases, the western clergymen has engaged in part in some secular calling in order to get the means to live while preaching the gospel. They, like Paul, worked with their own hands, because the Church could not, or would not support them. There is not one among them, who will not gladly drop all secular business, whenever the Church undertakes their support. They know full as well as their eastern brethren, that a release from secular labors would greatly increase their efficiency.

Another complaint sometimes heard, is that the Lutherans of American birth, when they come west, lose their affection for the Church of their fathers. This may indeed happen sometimes, but it is not by any means so general as represented. I have found as warm an attachment among

the Lutherans, that come west, for their own church, as exists among the members of other denominations. I have never witnessed greater exhibitions of joy than among our people, when in the west, they met brethren in the faith, and especially ministers of their own Church. The persistence with which they hold out against the attempts to proselyte them is worthy of all praise. Often, only after they have given up all hope of ever having a Lutheran church do they unite with other communions. No language can express the plaintive longings that are often heard from our scattered people, for the establishment of churches among them.

Wherever in the west our Church is properly represented it commands the respect of the public. The Christian world will never voluntarily leave the memory of the reformation to perish. And if we are not recreant to our duty, but properly assert ourselves, the Church of the reformation will never cease to excite the admiration and the respect of men-

The question then returns, what is our great want? We have the materials for new churches in greater abundance than other denominations. Our people are not disinclined to unite again with Lutheran churches. It is also evident from the many letters of inquiry for western charges, that many of our ministers would be ready to come and cultivate these western fields, if the means of support were provided.

The great want is—we may as well be honest and say it—money. Our Home Missionary Society is not supplied with funds to establish missions where they are needed in the west. Again and again, have we marked out promising mission fields. No salary, however, could be raised to begin with. When brethren were written to, to come here and cultivate these fields, the general inquiry was, how much salary can they raise. When they were told that next to nothing could be given at first for the support of a pastor, the matter was dropped. Other churches have pursued a different policy. Wherever they could organize a church of half a dozen of members it was done, a pastor was supplied and his salary furnished from abroad. The Presbyterians, for example, have

established in Nebraska seventy-five mission churches that are supplied by thirty-five home missionaries, each of whom receives, on an average, nearly five hundred dollars from their Home Missionary Society. They expend, therefore, over $17,000 a year in Nebraska alone for home missions. And yet they have only five self sustaining pastoral charges in the State—not by any means as many as the Lutherans of the General Synod. They have, however, thirty-five times as many missionaries as we have. The Congregationalists have even more missions, and are expending much more money for missions than the Presbyterians. These denominations even calculate on a certain per cent. of failures, and are not astonished when they occur. The fact is, that if we had half as much a year to expend for home missions as either of these churches, the Church of the Reformation would become as strong in Nebraska and as influential as it is in Pennsylvania. I repeat therefore, that the great need in our mission work is money, and if the money is furnished, the men can be had, and could have been had all along in the history of this work in Nebraska.

I confess that I have been in a state of feeling akin to despair on this subject. When engaged in the home mission work, I made similar statements at Synods in the east, in letters, and in newspaper articles. Apparently it struck no cord and had no response. Prayers and appeals for help were alike ineffectual. Mine was no exceptional experience. Brother H. W. Kuhns, who first started the mission work in this State, in the fall of 1853, while it was an infant territory, and who labored with great enthusiasm, zeal, and self-denial, to lay the foundations of our Church, frequently placed before the Church the conditions and needs of this vast field. Brother J. W. Kuhlman, who commenced his labors at Fontenelle, and who is with us here, Brother Eli Huber, who established the Church in Nebraska City, and who is now in Philadelphia, and Brother J. G. Groenmiller—I bear glad testimony to the fact that these brethren labored here with great fidelity and self denial. They, like myself, have felt betimes that appeals for help fell on deaf ears and comparatively indifferent hearts. And yet perhaps our iso-

lated and lonely condition made us expect too much from the eastern church, which, not having the magnitude of the western work under its own direct observation, permitted itself to become so absorbed with its own wants, that it had little time, sympathy, or money to give for the missionary enterprises beyond the Missouri. Had it been otherwise, the Lutheran Church to-day, would be second to no other in numbers and influence in Nebraska. Would to God that this Missionary Convention could inaugurate a new era in mission work. Let us remember, that to do this the Church must be brought to contribute, not twelve but fifty or seventy thousand dollars a year for mission purposes. She has the wealth, and the ability to do this, and if it is not speedily done, some Christians will have a fearful account to render at the judgment of the great day. At Synods, and at the meetings of the General Synod, missionary meetings, generally limited to an insignificant amount of time, have distinguished themselves oftenest by resolving great things, and then doing no more than before. The great things determined on paper have not taken place. And I have no confidence that they will now be performed in the direction of filling our mission treasuries, unless the Master interferes to transmute our Church into a new life. Because with all its grandeur of character, it has this one fault, this great blemish, that it is not doing its part in evangelizing the masses, and not even properly taking care of its own people, who through the movements of the divine providence, seek homes in the great west. Some of the brethren here insist that the Church is about to make a new departure, that the day of small things is past, that simply "resoluting" is over for ever; and that hereafter something will be done commensurate with the importance of the mission work of the General Synod. It certainly is an auspicious indication, that a Home Missionary Convention is held in one of the great mission territories of the Church. And the problem for solution is, how can we make this Convention something else than mere talk? How can the Church be made conscious of the magnitude of the work to be done? It is in the hands of God. He is and must be our only hope.

ARTICLE VII.

OF THE USE OF THE SACRAMENTS.*

By W. M. Baum, D. D., Philadelphia.

To the Christian enterprise and ardent church-love of the Rev. Samuel A. Holman, A. M., an alumnus of this Institution, of the class of 1859, the faithful and beloved Pastor of Calvary Ev. Lutheran Church of Philadelphia, Pa., are we indebted for the occasion of our present assembling. The course of annual lectures upon the *Augsburg Confession*, of which twelve have already been delivered and published, was conceived by him, and by him liberally endowed.

Thus has he had the satisfaction of witnessing the gradual and regular accomplishment of his design, whilst still comparatively a young man, nor has the Church been compelled to encounter the uncertainties of the future, or to be kept in waiting a single year for its advantages.

The able and distinguished lecturers, who have preceded me, have been pleased, without exception, and with most manifest propriety and advantage, to discuss the articles of the Confession in the order of their occurrence. From this most worthy example there shall be no departure upon this occasion. The subject of the *Thirteenth Article*, which falls to our present examination and study, is intensely interesting and pre-eminently adapted to the wants and peculiarities of our times. It belongs very pertinently to the question of the day. Of the entire number we could scarcely have selected one more promising or more desirable. May its discussion be attended with the divine blessing.

No sooner had the work of the Reformation been fully inauguated, than it became manifest that a vital pivotal point was to be found in the question of *the Sacraments.* Rome

---

* Thirteenth Lecture on the Augsburg Confession, on the Holman Foundation, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., by Wm. M. Baum, D. D., May 28th, 1878.

had so perverted the design and intent thereof, in the abuses of the Mass, that no reconciliation was possible. Unwilling as the Reformers were to make an irreconcilable breach with existing church authorities, they nevertheless refused to sacrifice or compromise the truth for the sake of temporary quietude. This question, therefore of necessity, occupies a very prominent place in the *Augsburg Confession.*

We have already had presented in learned and exhaustive discussions, upon the *ninth* and *tenth* articles, the teachings of the word of God as held by the Reformers, and the Church since then, of the doctrines of **Baptism* and the †*Lord's Supper*, separately considered. It remains, in order to complete the cycle of sacramental theology, to consider the question of *the sacraments* in the abstract, as it is set forth in the *thirteenth* article, whose caption is in these words: "*Of the use of the Sacraments.*"

Not only did diversity and conflict with Rome appear upon this great question, but very soon were these manifest within the narrow circle of the disenthralled Church. Luther and Zwingli, at Marburg, are both a type and a prophecy of the conflicting tendencies and theories in Protestantism. Around one or the other have gathered the mind and the heart of all succeeding teachers and expounders of God's word, maintaining each, to this hour, his own interpretation with as unyielding pertinacity and divergent conclusions, as did the great champions, their prototypes, upon that historic occasion.

The accepted English version of this article of the Augsburg Confession is thus given, and is a faithful rendering of the original:‡

"*Concerning the use of the Sacraments our Churches teach, that they were instituted not only as the marks of a Christian profession amongst men; but rather as signs and evidences of the will of God toward us, for the purpose of exciting and confirming the faith of those who use them. Hence the sacraments ought to*

---

*By Rev. F. W. Conrad, D. D., Quarterly Review, 1874, p. 477.
†By Rev. Geo. Diehl, D. D., Quarterly Review, 1875, p. 489.
‡See Creeds of Christendom (Schaff), vol. 3, p. 15.

be received with faith in the promises which are exhibited and set forth by them.

They therefore condemn those who teach that the sacraments justify (ex opere operato) by the mere performance of the act, and who do not teach that faith, which believes our sins to be forgiven, is required in the use of the sacraments."

The sacramental idea belongs to both the Old and the New Testament dispensations. The name, it is true, is not found in the Bible, but the thing signified is plainly revealed and enjoined. Although not distinguished by any particular title, we have the ordinances pertaining to our holy religion minutely described. *Circumcision* and the *Passover* in the Old testament dispensation, *Baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper* in the New, with whatever these involve and include, are instituted. Their observance in the Church, and by the Church, is implied and demanded by the very fact of their divine appointment and preservation.

THE EARLY CHRISTIAN FATHERS.

The teaching of the early Christian Fathers concerning the sacraments, are neither very definite, nor very satisfactory. With all we find due appreciation of the importance of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but not a very clear apprehension of their relation to each other, or to the other rites and ceremonies of our faith.

The word "*Sacrament*" comes into the terminology of Christianity mainly through the Vulgate, and other ancient Latin versions of the Bible. It is there used in the translation as the synonym of the Greek *μυστήριον*, including of course many more things than the two sacraments of later times. Its introduction and use may also be traced, in part, to a classic origin. The latin word "*Sacramentum*" was used to designate the sum of money deposited with the high priest, or legal functionary, before the commencement of a suit at law, and which was forfeited for public uses, by the defeated party. It was also employed to signify an oath, such as that by which the soldier bound himself to fidelity to his commander and his country.

Even Pagan usages may have contributed to the employment of some special designation for the rites and ceremonies of Christianity. Their priests, in order to enhance their importance in the eyes of the multitude, were accustomed to celebrate their sacred rites in secret and to call them *mysteries.* The early Christian Fathers* sought similar results by performing Baptism and the Lord's Supper privately, from which all were excluded but the initiated, and hence the title mysteries or sacraments.

We may not be able to say with certainty, why this term was selected, and appropriated to this special service, or why this special and limited signification was given to it, but of the fact there remains no doubt. Its continuance in this usage, for so many centuries, identifies it forever with the sacred ordinances of Christianity.

With the earliest patristic writers, the use of this term was not as limited as it has since become.

Tertullian† was confessedly the most influential among the Fathers, in the matter of terminology. To him may be traced the introduction of the phrases so long in use, Novum Testamentum, Trinitas, Peccatum Originale, Satisfactio, &c. With him begins the use of *Sacramentum* in this connection. He speaks of sacramentum baptismatis et eucharistiae, and sacramentum aquae et eucharistae, whilst he also uses it in a more general sense, speaking even of the Christian Religion as a sacrament.

Cyprian, who comes next in order of time, does not seem to observe any exclusive terminology. He applies this word indiscriminately, to the Lord's Supper, to the Trinity, and the Lord's prayer. Thus it appears, that whatever implied a high religous idea, as well as the more profound doctrines of the Church, were spoken of as sacraments, without any acknowledged recognition of a systematic definition.

In the day and under the influence of *Augustine*, who, if not the most learned, is ever regarded as the greatest of the Chris-

---

*See Dr. E. Pond's Christian Theology, pp. 670, 671.

†Hagenbach's Hist. of Doctrines, vol. I, p. 212.

tian Fathers, the idea of the sacraments, was much more clearly apprehended and defined. Without speaking of their number, he designates them as *the visible word*, and unfolded the mysterious union of the word with the external element. When honestly and logically applied, we believe, the definitions of Augustine* will leave none but those now included by Protestants in the number of the sacraments, yet even he at times uses the word in a more general sense, embracing matrimony, holy orders, exorcism, *i. e.* the renunciation of the Devil at Baptism, and other sacred ceremonies.

THE SCHOLASTICS.

Among the scholastics, the sacraments had special interest and significance. Accepting the terminology of Tertullian, and the definition of Augustine, they attempted to formulate their views more definitely and systematically.

Special attention was given *to the number*† of the Sacraments. There seems to be no rule or standard for a satisfactory determination of this difficult question, which was intensified by their divergent views and definitions, until the happy thought occurred to Peter Lombard, that as seven was the sacred number, there must needs be seven sacraments. Rabanus Maurus advocated four, Dionysius Areopagiticus demanded six, whilst Peter Damiani would be content with nothing short of twelve, the apostolic number. The scholastic acuteness and determined zeal of Peter Lombard, however prevailed, and his view was endorsed and approved, first by the Council of Florence, 1439, and then of Trent, 1547, and continues unto this day, as the accepted number, held and proclaimed by the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The views of Hugo of St. Victor deserve a passing notice. He divided the sacraments into three classes; first, those pertaining to Salvation, viz: Baptism, Confirmation and the Lord's Supper;

---

*Sacramentum est sacra rei signum; Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum.

See Hagenbach's Hist. of Doctrines, vol. II, p. 76.

†See Dr. Van Osterzee, vol. II, p. 741.

See Dr. Hodge's Systematic Theology, vol. III. p. 495.

secondly, those pertaining to Sanctification, viz: the use of holy water, sprinkling with ashes, etc.; thirdly, those pertaining to preparation for utilizing the others, such as holy orders, the consecration of the robes of the clergy and others.

Before leaving this interesting and fruitful chapter of the writings of the ante-reformation period, we cite the speculations of the well known Bonaventura. Accepting the number seven as the true one, he brought them severally into connection with the seven diseases of man. *Original sin* is counteracted by *Baptism*, *Mortal sin*, by *Penance*, *Venial sin*, by *Extreme Unction*, *Ignorance* is cured by *Ordination*, *Malice*, by the *Lord's Supper*, *Infirmity* by *Confirmation*, and *Evil Concupiscence*, by *Matrimony*. The criticism of Schleiermacher upon this representation is no less just than humorous: "the poor laity have no sacrament for ignorance, nor have the poor clergy a sacrament to counteract lusts." The fertile brain of this ecclesiastic soon discovered an intimate connection between the seven sacraments and the seven cardinal virtues of humanity; thus *Baptism* leads to *faith*, *Confirmation* to *hope*, the *Lord's Supper* to *love*, *Penance* to *righteousness*, *Extreme Unction* to *perseverance*, *Ordination* to *wisdom*, Matrimony to moderation.

Thomas Aquinas finds the analogy between the natural and spiritual life of man, both recognized and provided for in the existence of the seven sacraments. Thus man is born —then strengthened—then nourished—furnished with means of recovery from illness—with means to propagate his race—to live under the guidance of legitimate authority, and to be prepared for his departure from this world. The exact counterpart for all this, he finds in his spiritual nature, and for all these necessities and emergencies the sacraments make full provision. Man is born spiritually in baptism—strengthened by confirmation—nourished by the Lord's Supper—recovered from spiritual malady by penance—the Church is continued by holy matrimony—a supernatural guide is found in the sacrament of orders whilst extreme unction completes the equipment for death.

Such is a mere glance at the gradual development of the sacramental idea, which is manifestly ecclesiastical rather than biblical in its nature. As far as it is in perfect accord with the teachings of the word of God, it is or should be accepted by Christians, but as it is now enunciated, it is not *formally* found therein.

THE REFORMERS.

We are thus prepared the better to appreciate the complex difficulties which attended the work of the Reformers, and the more to admire the discernment, wisdom, and fidelity, they displayed in its accomplishment.

As in the day of Christ, the truth of the Old Testament had been obscured and almost buried beneath the additions and traditions of the Scribes and Elders, so in the day of the Reformation, the truth of the Gospel was in like manner sadly disfigured and distorted by the inventions and the speculations of the schoolmen the mystics and the ecclesiastics, and could scarcely be any longer recognized as the word of Christ and of His apostles.

To bring order out of this chaos, to eliminate the simple truth out of its intricate enfoldings, to sift and to separate the divine from the human in the current teachings of the Church, was the duty and the danger of the hour. To it the framers and expounders of the Augsburg Confession were called and committed, and in it they achieved a success as marvelous as it has been enduring. Inferior to the first apostles only in the particular of personal intercourse with Christ, and of direct inspiration, they have witnessed such a good confession, that to this day we thankfully believe it and proudly teach it.

The article under consideration is itself the best and most satisfactory exhibit of the views of the Reformers upon the subject of which it treats.

So happily conceived and accurately stated is it, that it has been the easily recognized basis of every subsequent protestant Confession, as it has been bodily* transferred and almost

*See Dr. Morris' Art. in the Phila. Luth. Diet, 1877, pp. 15–26.

literally incorporated as article XXV. of the Articles of Religion of the Church of England.

In a few exceptional cases only,* as in the Apology to the Augsburg Confession, and then not absolutely but figuratively, as is affirmed and maintained by the learned and ingenuous Dr. Leonard Hutter, do any of the Confessional writings or acknowledged leaders of the Reformation speak of more than two sacraments. Baptism and the Lord's Supper alone meet all the requirements thereof. Other rites and ceremonies of the Church, which may be very appropriate in themselves, and very helpful to believers, may also in some particulars partake of a sacramental character, and may in many respects resemble a true Sacrament, yet do not complete the entire representation, so as to justify their permanent enrollment as of divine appointment.

At the time of the preparation of the Augsburg Confession, and the enunciation of the faith of what has since grown into the well defined system of Protestantism, two fearful evils concerning the Sacraments were possible; two terrible extremes, alike dangerous, were imminent. The avoidance of the one greatly endangered the encountering of the other. Many a precious bark in fleeing Scylla, has been wrecked upon Charybdis. May we not devoutly recognize and acknowledge God's hand in the guidance of the Gospel crew, by which they escaped both, and, as we firmly believe, rescued the Church from the errors and evils of materialistic exaggeration on the one hand, as seen in the *ex opere operato*

---

* *Melanchthon* at first questioned the propriety of using a word not found in the Bible to designate the sacred institutions of the Church: vide, Loci Communes, 1521, (Cor. Ref. ed. Bretschneider, p. 210). According to Thiérsch, II., p. 206, he would have allowed ordination and marriage to be sacraments, as he actually admitted absolution in the Apology: "absolutio proprie dici protest sacramentum." In the Loci Com. 1521, (Cor. Ref., p. 211), however he says "Duo sunt antem signa a Christo in Evangelio instituta; baptismus et participatio mensæ Domini.

Luther speaks of Baptismus, Poenitentia, Panis as sacraments, in in his work, De Captiv. Babyl., whilst in his Catech. Major, penance is included in baptism. See Hagenbach, Vol. 2 : 303.

fallacy of the Papacy, and its effeminate offspring usually denominated High Churchism, and of rationalistic ignoring, on the other, by which all meaning and efficiency are lost, as seen in the mere outward ceremony theory of Socinianism, and its natural concomitant usually designated Zwinglianism.

Safely and grandly between these did they direct their course, bringing out, in the clearest light, the nature, necessity, design, and significance of these divine institutions.

In endeavoring to arrive at a clear and definite view of the teachings of the Reformers and the Symbols upon this question, we are at the same time attaining acquaintance with the views of the ablest theologians of all subsequent times. Their masterly efforts and scriptural statements have well nigh exhausted the field of inquiry, and leave but little for us to accomplish, except to verify and emphasize their statements.

Such was the providential disposition of the Christian world, political and religious, in that day, that the whole energy of human thought, the whole power of human learning, and the whole strength of human faith, and love, and party attachment were given to the study, and the defence of the doctrines of the Gospel. It was a single and an absorbing pursuit. The results attained demonstrate the thoroughness and the fidelity of the labor performed.

It is very manifest that neither the Old nor the New Testament scriptures furnish any formal definition of a Sacrament; nor do the writings of the Greek Apologists, or the Latin Fathers, or the school-room of the middle ages, present anything that has been regarded as authoritative and final. The conclusions of the Council at Trent have decided the question so far as Romanism is concerned, and though widely and diametrically opposed thereto, evangelical Protestantism has also reached very clear and definite, and, may we not believe, ultimate conclusions.

Beginning with the simple idea of *mystery*, as descriptive of the doctrines and usages of the Redeemer's Kingdom, we have next the added thought of obligation incurred by

the believer and the participant. Then comes out more definitely the relation between the written word and the instituted ordinance, and then gradually the conception of the Sacraments as a channel, and finally as the only channel through which God's grace is bestowed upon man. Beyond this it is difficult to conceive to what human ingenuity or ecclesiastical device could have advanced. Divine grace shut up to the Sacraments; the Sacraments belonging exclusively to the Church; the Church the only depository and guard of the word of God—there can be of course no salvation out of the Church, and there can be no opposition or resistance of the power or decisions of the Church. Having received the efficacious grace signified and conferred by the use of the Sacraments, these need only be continued by the faithful, to have it strengthened and increased, or assiduously used by the negligent to have it restored.

It matters very little what we call a Sacrament, if our definition be broad enough to embrace it, and there is nothing in revelation or in history, that presents any limit. Nor does it matter how many Sacraments we regard as obligatory, provided only we do not give to all the same authority, nor ascribe to them all the same import and efficacy.*

In order, however, to reach uniformity of view and practice, and to avoid the risk of teaching such unscriptural exaggerations as were endorsed and promulgated by the Council

---

*Apol. Conf. Art. VII. "With respect, however, to the *seven* sacraments, we find that the Father's differed, consequently these seven ceremonies are not all *equally* necessary.

If we regard as sacraments, the external signs and ceremonies which God enjoined, and with which he connected the promise of grace, it is easy to determine what are Sacraments; for ceremonies and other external things, instituted by men, are not sacraments in this sense, because men cannot promise the grace of God without divine authority. Signs, therefore, which are instituted, without the command of God, are not signs of grace; although they may be memorials to children, and to the ignorant, like a painted cross."

"But no intelligent man will lay great stress upon the number of sacraments, whether seven or more; *provided only that the word and command of God be maintained.*"

of Trent, and yet not incur the charge Romanism constantly makes, that we ignore and destroy the Sacraments, our Theologians have drawn, in their writings, full and frequent descriptions of their nature, design and efficacy. These are briefly, but yet thoroughly and scientifically stated, in the Article of the Augsburg Confession under consideration.

THE SYMBOLS.

In systematic theology, the Sacraments belong to the department of *Soteriology.* They logically and necessarily follow "the word of God," in the enumeration of the means of grace and of salvation. The initial operation of the Holy Ghost upon the heart and conscience of man is through the word. When not opposed and resisted by the will of man, the truth of God produces its appointed and legitimate results: "it has an active, supernatural and truly divine power of producing supernatural effects; in other words, of converting, regenerating, and renewing the minds of men."* This power, transcending beyond comparison, all that may be predicated of the convincing force of the highest human oratory, is due solely and entirely to the presence and efficacy of the Holy Spirit in the word. In the economy of redemption and the application of the means of grace, the word and the Spirit are always associated.

By this provision the way is opened for imparting grace to man; but the faith wrought by *the preached word* must be strengthed and confirmed, for which there has been appointed in the Church *the visible word*, in the form of divinely instituted rites or ceremonies, now named Sacraments, through which, by means of external visible signs, this saving grace is secured to man, or if already possessed, is reassured to him.

Chemnitz, Ex. Tr. Con., says: "God does not impart His grace in this life all at once, so that it is straitway absolute and finished, so that God has nothing more to confer, man nothing more to receive; bnt God is always giving and man

*See Schmid's Doct. Theol. Luth. Church, p. 517.

is always receiving, so as ever to be more closely and perfectly joined to Christ, to hold more and more firmly the pardon of sins; so that that the benefits of redemption, which have been begun in us, may be preserved, strengthened, and increased."

This we regard as the true import and interpretation of the teaching of the Augsburg Confession, and of the Apology, concerning the use of the Sacraments, which is also reiterated and reaffirmed with unexampled uniformity of view, by the long line of able and learned divines, who have been revered and trusted in our Church as expounders of the word of God, and "of the faith of our Church founded upon that word."

The views of Luther, Melanchthon, and the other theologians at Wittenberg, prior to the Diet in 1530, may be regarded as authoritatively and accurately set forth in the Augsburg Confession, which received their united and unqualified approval and endorsement. Therein they utter no uncertain sound. They were distinctly understood, as they designed they should be, not only by the great body of the theologians of the papal hierarchy, but also by those violent errorists, the Anabaptists, and such enthusiasts as Andrew Bodenstein, familiarly known as Carlstadt, the place of his birth, and Zwinglius and Œcolampadius, and the like.

In the first paragraph of the seventh article of the Apology, it is stated: "Our adversaries admit our assertion in the thirteenth article, that Sacraments are not mere signs, by which men recognize each other, like the countersign, court-livery, &c., but efficacious signs and sure testimonies of God's grace and purposes towards us, by which He admonishes and strengthens our hearts to believe the more firmly and joyfully." In a subsquent paragraph of this same article, we have this additional testimony: "We cannot, however, too carefully consider, or speak too freely of the abuses and errors introduced by the pernicious, shameful and impious doctrine of the *opus operatum*, namely, that the mere use of the Sacraments, the work performed, makes us just before God, and secures His grace, even without a good disposition of the

heart. Hence originated the unspeakable and abominable abuse of the mass. They cannot show a particle of truth from the writings of the ancient Fathers to support the opinions of the scholastics. Nay, Augustine says, directly to the contrary, that it is not the Sacraments that justify, but *faith* in their use justifies us in the sight of God." From this noble utterance, alike evangelical, scriptural and Lutheran, no genuine Protestant can logically dissent. Of it we may quote the hearty endorsement of many names widely and most favorably known and honored for their piety, ability, and learning.

ENDORSEMENT OF THE SYMBOLS.

From Martin Chemnitz, "the greatest pupil of Melanchthon and the prince among the Lutheran divines of his age," one of the most famous of the learned Professors at Wittenberg, who was already in the promise of early manhood when Luther died, and who had attained the maturity of his powers when Melanchthon was called to his reward, and who with Andreæ and Selnecker formed the theological triumvirate who more than all others gave shape, and form, and point to the Formula of Concord, we make the following extract:*

"God, in those things which pertain to our salvation is pleased to treat with us through certain means; he himself has ordained this use of them, and instituted the word of gospel promise, which sometimes is proposed to us *by itself or nakedly*, and sometimes *clothed or made visible* by certain rites or sacraments appointed by him."

From the equally learned and distiguished teacher and auther, who followed Chemnitz as Professor at Wittenberg, the voluminous Dr. Leonard Hutter, we offer the following:†

"A Sacrament is a sacred rite divinely instituted, consisting partly of an external element or sign, and partly of a celestial object, by which God not only seals the promise of grace peculiar to the Gospel (*i. e.* of gratuitous reconciliation,) but also truly presents through the external elements, to the individuals using the Sacrament, the celestial blessings promised

*Ex. Trie., II., 35. †Comp. Loc. Th., 221, 214.

in the institution of each of them, and also savingly applies the same to those who believe."

Dr. John Gerhard, the pupil of Hutter, who has been often called the most eminent of Lutheran Theologians, and of whom the venerable Dr. Tholuck said "he was the most learned, and with the learned, the most beloved, among the heroes of Lutheran Orthodoxy,"* writes the following, (VIII., 328): "A Sacrament is a sacred and solemn rite, divinely instituted, by which God, through the ministry of man, dispenses heavenly gifts, under a visible and external element, through a certain word, in order to offer, apply and seal to those using them *and believing*, the special promise of the Gospel concerning the gratuitous remission of sins."

"Two things are absolutely requisite to constitute a Sacrament, properly so called, viz., the word, and the element according to the well-known saying of Augustine: 'The word is added to the element and it becomes a Sacrament.' This assertion is based upon the very nature and aim of the Sacraments, since the sacraments are intended to present to the senses, in the garb of an external element, that same thing that is preached in the gospel message, from which it readily follows that neither the word without the element, nor the element without the word, constitutes the Sacrament. By the word is understood, first, the command and divine institution through which the element, because thus appointed by God, is separated from a common use and set apart for a sacramental use; and, secondly, the promise, peculiar to the Gospel, to be applied and sealed by the Sacrament. By the element is meant not any arbitrarily chosen element, but that which has been fixed and mentioned in the words of the institution."

John Andrew Quenstedt, D. D., another of the truly distinguished Professors of Wittenberg, writes thus: "God has added to the word of the Gospel, as another communicative

*See Dr. J. A. Seiss' "Digest of Christian Doctrine," Introduction.

means of salvation, the Sacraments which constitute the visible word."

That we may not burden this discussion with excessive quotation, we omit many others of similar import and authority. The citations already adduced serve the double purpose, of showing what interpretation was put upon the Confession and its Apology on this subject, and of the striking agreement, in all essential particulars, between these several witnesses.

Theology, it has been said, is not a progressive science. This is true of this doctrine. There was advance in the interpretation and representation of it, until it was brought to conform in all particulars with the revealed teachings of God's word, but when once clearly expressed in the happy terms of the Confession, it has remained unchanged unto this day, and will, we may confidently believe, continue in this form until the means of grace shall happily no longer be needed.

In the light which this discussion, thus far, has brought to the understanding of this important and interesting article of our Confession, we may venture to examine in detail its several declarations.

THE SACRAMENTS AS EXTERNAL SIGNS.

"*Concerning the use of the Sacraments, our churches teach that they were instituted not only as marks of a (Christian) profession among men. . .*"

If "*not only*" (non modo) for this purpose, yet manifestly, *along with this purpose*, for something beyond. The purpose for which they were instituted was not limited to this one design.

We accept then the Sacraments as "marks of a profession amongst men;" as pertaining to the visibility of the Church, and as such both valuable and indispensable. We have only to consider the necessities of our complex nature, of reason and sense, of body and soul, to be convinced of the wisdom and the propriety of a set of external rites and ceremonies in our system of religion. There must be arrangement and provision for the whole nature of man, for the exercise of all his

faculties and powers, so that through his bodily senses, his spiritual emotions may be aroused and sustained.

Under the Abrahamic Covenant, a proselyte could only be admitted to the immunities of citizenship in the commonweath of Israel by submitting to the rite of circumcision, in like manner, participation in the Christian Sacraments is a public declaration of faith in Christ. They are, therefore, "badges of Christian men's profession."

Our blessed Saviour did not confine Himself in His instructions to the mere utterance of the word, the simple declaration of the truth, but ever accompanied it with some striking illustration, pressing into His service whatever nearest at hand presented itself as available. The occupations and occurrences of His hearers, the objects within the vision of those about Him, helped to unfold His meaning and quicken their apprehension. A system that has no reference to the bodily constitution of man, may do for angels, but it is not fitted for men, since it ignores one half their nature.

Quakers* reject both the name and the idea of a Sacrament. According to Barclay, they acknowledge only spiritual baptism and a mystical Lord's Supper.

The rejection of a name, confessedly not in the Bible, and never enjoined by divine authority, is not a matter of any importance. If those who use it, do so, by their own option, the same right remains to those who do not use it, to refuse its adoption.

The rejection of an idea, however, which involves the ignoring of positive enactments, the disregard of the word and the example of our blessed Lord and of His immediate followers, is immeasurably more serious and responsible.

The authority to spiritualize, and thereby entirely to destroy the commanded ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, implies and demands similar treatment of all of Christ's commanded institutions. *Marriage* with all its blessed sanctions and restraints must be rejected; *public worship* with all its supports and incentives, must be abandoned;

---

* See Winer's Confessions of Christendom, p. 230.

the *Sabbath*, with all its healthful and corrective power must be obliterated; and the *Church* as an institution of God must be disbanded.

The logic which puts a period to the validity of Christ's commands, necessarily terminates the value of His promises. Whilst it excludes external ceremonies from the Church, it destroys the Church itself, leaves believers without the means of mutual recognition and assistance, destroys both opportunity and motive, either to declare or to defend our faith in Christ, and our love to God, or to detect and expose, to resist and refute false doctrines and errors. Upon the supposition of the truth and inspiration of the Gospel narratives, in which is contained the record of the appointment, by Christ, of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, with the accompanying commands as to their continuance, we may well demand the reasons for their abrogation. When and by whom was the edict promulgated? By what authentication was it attended? What occurences or circumstances rendered their further use no longer desirable or necessary?

The value and utility of the Sacraments, in this respect, may be clearly recognized in their influence upon the maintenance and propagation of Religion. Thereby children are instructed as to the nature of God's kingdom and their attachment to it secured. Thereby heathen, heretics and unbelievers are addressed, and may be impressed when the preached word would be disregarded. Thereby the powerful bond of human friendship and fellowship is introduced, to strengthen the hands of the weak and support the faith of the faint.

The public administration of the Sacraments, pointing back, as they do, with unerring certainty to the time and the circumstances of their institution by Christ, are an argument in behalf of Christianity, the value of which cannot be overstated. Infidelity must account for their origin, their introduction, their prevalence and their uninterrupted continuance. Except upon the ground of their appointment by divine command, their hold upon the mind and heart of our race would not endure beyond a single generation. There is

nothing to maintain their irresistible sway among Christians, except their superhuman adaptation to the wants and the necessities of our condition. That adaptation proclaims their high origin and pleads for their preservation and perpetuity. Their number is sufficient to give form and visibility to the Church of Christ, without being burdensome. They are impressive and suggestive in their influence upon the mind and heart, and capable of universal application. In all the centuries of their existence, no complaint has yet been preferred by the devout worshiper, that they have lost their freshness or their meaning. True, the highest form of worship is that which is purely spiritual, and to this we are invited, encouraged and urged, but this we cannot hope to reach until, in the resurrection, we shall have undergone that wondrous change, by which our present material bodies shall become *spiritual bodies.* Until then they must needs retain their confessional character, and continue to be used as "marks of profession amongst men."

THE SACRAMENTS AS MEANS OF GRACE.

The concluding portion of the paragraph under consideration is in these words: "*but rather as signs and evidences of the will of God towards us, for the purpose of exciting and confirming the faith of those who use them.*"

The former use and purpose they did truly subserve, and were intended to subserve, but that did not exhaust the design of their appointment. According to this statement, they have their most special import and reference to the recipient. They look not only to the visible, external Church, and supply it with needful ceremonies for the reception and recognition of its members, but also to the spiritual wants and necessities of the individual believer, and supply signs and evidences,(testimonies of God's disposition towards us). This brings before us the innermost meaning and intent of these sacred and divine institutions. No wonder that the early Church called them "mysteries," for who can fathom them?

We naturally and properly turn to the Apology, as the first authorized and accepted commentary upon the text of

the Confession, for explanation of the sense in which its words are used. To the question, how are we to interpret the declaration that the Sacraments are "*signs and evidences of the will of God towards us,*" we have reply: "the Sacraments are not mere signs * * * but efficacious signs and sure testimonies of God's grace and purpose towards us, by which He admonishes and strengthens our hearts to believe the more firmly and joyfully." "The external signs were instituted to move our hearts, namely, both by the word and the external signs, to believe, when we are baptized, and when we receive the Lord's body, that God will be truly merciful to us, through Christ, as Paul, Rom. 10 : 17, says: "*Faith cometh by hearing.*" "As the word enters our ears, so the external signs are placed before our eyes, inwardly to excite and move the heart to faith. The word and the external signs work the same thing in our hearts; as Augustine well says: 'the Sacrament is a visible word;' for the external sign is like a picture, and signifies the same thing that is preached by the word; both, therefore, effect the same thing." "The proper use of the Sacraments requires faith, to believe *the divine promises and receive the promised grace which is offered through the Sacraments and the word.*" "The Sacraments are external signs and seals of the promises." "We should firmly believe then that *the grace and remission of sins*, promised in the New Testament, are imparted to us."

These quotations lead to the conclusion that the Confession designs to represent the Sacraments as signs and evidences of God's purpose to pardon sin, to nurture grace, and to bestow salvation. They are signs not of our condition before God, or of our disposition towards God, but of His disposition and of His purposes of grace towards us.

After most carefully and honestly tracing the developments of the views of Luther upon this subject, the learned and reliable Dr. Dorner, of Berlin,* concludes his representation of the position to which the great reformer was conducted as follows: "the signs, and even the body and blood of

*History of Prot. Theol., vol. I, p. 158.

Christ, do not give something specially contained in them, which is not to be had otherwise; but they are only the sealing form, the pledge of the gift, by which the substance of the blessing, which lies in the word of promise, even in connection with the Holy Supper, may become the sooner fixed and be the more certain. *But the substance itself is the forgiveness of sins.* The body and blood of Christ are not properly in themselves regarded as the gift, which is the object of the Holy Supper, but they are only the means of assurance, divine and holy pledges of the proper gift, namely of *the forgiveness of sins with which life and Salvation are connected.* This then is the doctrine to which Luther continued essentially to adhere, and which has become peculiar to the Lutheran Church. The Holy Supper is, according to this form of doctrine, a promise of the forgiveness of sins, confirmed by signs or seals, wherein not merely bread and wine, but even and emphatically the present body and blood of Christ, form the pledge; and this in such a way, that faith receives the same matter both in and outside of the Sacrament, *the forgiveness of sins*, only in the Holy Supper with special external certification by means of the God-given pledge. *To this the Lutheran Confessions adhere.* Apol. 201: Idem effectus est verbi et ritus, after Augustine's language, Sacramentum esse verbum visibile, quia ritus est quasi pictura verbi, idem significans quod verbum, quare idem est utriusque effectus."

From this we anticipate no dissent, as of it, we believe, no positive denial can be sustained. We may, therefore, proceed to enumerate and describe the things signified and indicated in the two Christian Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

These Sacraments, in their external symbols, are designed to exhibit the blessings of God's covenant, and to shadow forth the benefits of redemption. The one ordinance meets the believer at the very threshhold of the Church, and, by its simple but significant ceremony, indicates the character which alone fits for worthy membership therein; the other attends him, with its equally appropriate service, throughout his entire pilgrimage, furnishing ever the needed evidence of

sustaining grace, and witnessing anew the presence of the risen Lord. The lessons they teach are invaluable, the influence they exert is most blessed.

As Baptism presents its water, it reveals the moral and spiritual filth which demands cleansing that we may become acceptable to God and fitted for fellowship with Him, and already promises the renewing power which attends the added word and accompanying Spirit. What could more aptly point out "*the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost*," which is shed abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour on all who are saved according to His mercy? Was not the same prophetically seen by the prophet of Chebar, when he writes in anticipation of this ordinance and of its high import: "*Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean?*" Ezek. 36 : 25. Baptism is therefore justly a sign of spiritual renewal, by which its recipient is fitted for the salvation and entitled to all the benefits, of the Covenant, 1 Titus 3 : 5.

Neither is the Lord's Supper an unmeaning ceremony. It too has its mode of administration and its necessary emblems. Its consecrated bread and wine most strikingly portray the broken body and the shed blood of the Redeemer. "*The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the blood of Christ?* The bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the body of Christ? 1 Cor. 10 : 16. "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come," 1 Cor. 11 : 26. Each new celebration of this ordinance is a most positive and emphatic re-declaration of the chiefest doctrines and revelations of the Christian religion. In its commemoration of the death of its Founder it re-asserts the sin and ruin of our race, making such sacrifice a necessity. It re-echoes the righteous indignation of a holy God against all evil-doers and transgressors. It unfolds the infinite resources of the Almighty in being able to provide a way of reconciling the conflicting demands of judgment and mercy. It sends forth anew the superhuman prayer: *Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do;*" heard alike on Earth and in Heaven, which, that it might be answered, forced

that other cry, which still makes angels wonder and mortals adore, "*My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?*" It affords the truest fulfillment of the Saviour's own most gracious words, "*God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.*" In that it places in the hand of each participant the appointed emblems, and bids each one, "*take, eat;*" "*drink ye all of this,*" the personal acceptance of every one, who receives it with faith in the promises which are exhibited and set forth, is reassured. In that all who believe and are gathered together in one place are cordially invited to unite in this observance, there is exhibited alike the duty and reality of "*the Communion of Saints,*" true type of that more blessed fellowship which will be eternal and complete in the world to come. In that the design and efficacy of Christ's sacrificial offering in our stead and in our behalf are ever thrust upon the eye, by this visible word, and upon the ear by the spoken word, in this grand sacramental communion, there is uttered to the soul the glad assurance that we are pardoned and saved through grace divine; and in that this festival has been appointed to continue to the end of this dispensation, we, by it, do show forth the Lord's death until He come, and thus keep alive the remembrance and the expectation of His "*appearing the second time without sin unto salvation; to be glorified in His saints, and to be admired in all them that believe.*" In a word, the whole gospel history culminates in the transactions commemorated in the Lord's Supper. The great truths of revelation and redemption centre around the cross, and as in these alone we can adequately discover the will of God toward us, Christ has graciously left in His Church this rite, that with its co-ordinate Sacrament of Baptism, it might testify to us of His gracious intentions to bestow His promised blessings and fulfill His covenanted engagements.

Dr. Dorner unfolds the workings of Luther's mind upon this point as follows: "Whilst *the word of God in the Holy Scriptures* is thus established as the means of grace in general,

grace assumes in the *Sacraments*, on the other hand, a form having reference still more immediately to the individual person, as living in a specified time and space. It is an expression of Luther's, in reference to this as frequent as it is singularly descriptive, that God "deals with us" (mit uns handle) through the means of grace."

"It does not satisfy the vital religious need, as it expresses itself in Luther, *to know* of a divine decree of salvation, whether concerning the individual person, or concerning the past, even although eternally valid, work of atonement, but the soul of the pious longs after the living God, and hence requires not merely past history or eternal decrees, but also deeds of love on the part of God, which, as it were, renew their youth, the present glance of love and greeting from above."*

TWOFOLD USE OF THE SACRAMENTS.

But the article under investigation represents the use of the Sacraments as twofold, designed not only to serve "as signs and evidences of the will of God towards us," but also "*for the purpose of exciting and confirming the faith of those who use them.*"

So admirably conceived and happily adjusted are they, that they accomplish this double office most successfully. They unfold God's grace and favor, by the manifestation of the truth concerning the divine will and covenant, and in response they invite and encourage implicit reliance upon the divine promises. They show the claim of God's word upon us, the security of the foundation upon which our faith is to rest and the blessed results it will effect.

It is true, "*faith cometh by hearing*," but the faith so wrought by the preached word, needs to be nourished and fed, so as to be preserved, strengthened and perfected, as the Apostles prayed, "*Lord increase our faith.*"

Faith is a living, vital power, and like every other form of life on earth, is capable of growth, under favorable conditions,

*Hist. of Prot. Theology, Vol. I., p. 147.

and so, also, is subject to injury and destruction by adverse influences, as St. Paul says (1 Tim. 1 : 19): "*Some concerning faith have made shipwreck.*" The Sacraments are not represented in this article of the Confession as bestowing or conferring faith in its beginnings, but as stirring up and confirming that which has been already established.

We cannot advance very far, in an examination of the symbols and authors of our Church upon the subject of the Sacraments, before we become convinced that *faith* is made the condition of their true benefit and efficacy. Under the long neglect and perversion of the dark ages, the moral condition of the participant was entirely disregarded, and the full advantages of the Church's ordinances were put unconditionally, sine bono motu utentis, at the disposal of the administrator. From this the Reformers dissented in the most positive manner.

As early as the year 1518, Luther declares the leading principle to be: "*Whatever may be the case with the Sacraments, faith must maintain its rights and honors*": * "*that without faith no blessing can come to a man from the Sacrament:* * * "*that the Sacraments do not effect the grace which they signify; not the Sacrament but faith in it justifies; it purifies, not because it takes place, but because it is believed,* (*non sacramentum, sed fides sacramenti justificat; abluit sacramentum non quia fit, sed quia creditur*); * * "*that faith may also receive*, apart from the Sacrament, the same thing as in the Sacrament, namely, the forgiveness of sins (through faith in the word."*

In the Apology (VII., 18,) it is affirmed, "We teach that *faith is necessary to the proper use of the Sacraments*; a faith which believes the promises and receives the things promised, which are here offered in the Sacrament. And the reason of this is plain and undeniable. A promise is useless to us, unless it is embraced by faith. But the Sacraments are signs of the promises, therefore faith is necessary to their proper use."

In perfect harmony with this representation are the views of the leading Lutheran Theologians unto the present day.

---

*See Dorner, Vol. 1, 151.

Out of the many at hand, we cite but a few. *Chemnitz* (Ex. C. Trid. II. 36): "The instrumental cause in this doctrine is two-fold; one is, as it were, the hand of God, by which, through the word and Sacraments, He offers, presents, applies, and seals the benefits of redemption to believers. The other is, as it were, our hand by which we *in faith*, ask, apprehend and receive those things which God offers to us through the word and Sacraments. The efficacy of the Sacraments is not such as though through them God infused, and as it were, impressed grace and salvation, even on unbelievers or believers." *Hollazius* (1061): "*Faith is necessarily required in order to the reception of the salutary efficacy of the Sacrament*," "The Sacraments confer no grace on adults, unless when offered they receive it by true *faith, which existed in their hearts previously.*"

Nor need we wonder that such prominence and emphasis are given to the matter of *faith*, in its relations to the Sacraments, or that this article concludes with a condemnation of the opposite theory.

"*They therefore condemn those who teach that the Sacraments justify* (*ex opere operato*) *by the mere performance of the act, and who do not teach that faith which believes our sins to be forgiven, is required in the use of the Sacraments.*"

PROTESTANTISM VERSUS ROMANISM.

A very little reflection will, we believe, make it manifest that the gist of the controversy between Protestantism and Romanism centres in this point.

Its interpretation decides the question of the way of Salvation. It cannot be denied, that two opposite theories are held, and that they are conflicting, antagonistic, irreconcilable, and mutually destructive of each other. There is no one point where they approximate so closely, as to merge imperceptibly into one another. Narrowness, shallowness, ignorance and blind partisan zeal have often, must we not say always, deceived and misled the unthinking, so as to cause them to lift into undue prominence, matters comparatively unimportant, and to display embittered hostility over ques-

tions of taste, of modes, of measures, or of men. True, everything pertaining to religion is important, but everything is not equally religious or equally important. But neither skill nor conciliation, nor cordiality, nor charity nor expediency nor explanation, nor admission nor silence, nor all these combined, can bridge the chasm between that familiarly known as the *ex opere operato* theory, and that of Faith, as taught in the Augsburg Confession and held in the Church of the Augsburg Confession, and of the Reformed Church at large. It is not a question of degrees, or of probabilties, or of preferences, or of historical development, but of scriptural representation, of theological dogma, of divine truth. Are we saved by faith, through grace, or are we saved by the Sacraments, through the Church? Or, as it is sometimes stated, do we come to Christ through the Church, or do we come to the Church through Christ?* We claim that this presentation is neither fanciful nor unfair, and if some object who hold the theory, but who do not like either the name or the organization of the papal hierarchy, we can only add, that by adopting the doctrinal tenets and the sacramental theory of Rome, they have already obliterrated all distinctive peculiarities, and are now separated from her only in name.

The blessed Saviour saw fit to defer the institution of the Sacraments until He had reached the very close of His earthly ministry. We cannot regard this as unintentional or circumstantial. Had they been necessary to the attainment of Faith, or more important and influential than the spoken word, He wonld have placed them at the very beginning of His work and thus have afforded His disciples the full benefits they would have conferred. The only means of grace they had, apart from the sacrificial observances of Judaism, was that of the word, and this was deemed enough.

In Protestant Theology, *the word* assumes and must ever maintain the first place, in enumerating the means of grace. It stands before the Sacraments, not in the order of impor-

*See Church and Christ, Litton, 159.

tance or of intrinsic value, as though one were to be balanced against the other, for they cannot thus be rightly compared or contrasted; but in the order of time, for the word was *first* spoken and is ever the first in its agency in building up the believer in a life of true godliness. The word proclaims Christ, as "*the way, the truth and the life*," the Holy Spirit ever attends, and accompanies its declaration, and if we may so speak, the Sacramental grace of the preached word leads to faith, saving faith, not a mere historic belief, but that faith which follows repentance and precedes salvation. Then and there are the place and the value and the efficacy of the Sacraments to be recognized and acknowledged. Rome,* in *contrast* with the Bible, elevates the Sacraments above the word in her estimate of the means of grace, the Greek Church, in *conflict* with it, hardly regards the word as a means of grace, whilst in the scriptures, it is to the word that most frequent reference is made when speaking of the agency by which man's salvation is secured. The Sacraments demand for their proper and profitable reception suited and adequate spiritual preparation, as they claim and proclaim corresponding fitness and attainment in all their participants. But how shall this be secured, if faith be not made to precede? "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth." "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." Nothing can be clearer than that in every case of adult admission to the initiative right of Baptism, as recorded in the New Testament, repentance and faith are either declared or implied. The word, received by faith, and applied by the Holy Spirit, is the only true preparation for the reception of the blessings belonging to the Sacraments. These blessings are not to be regarded as consisting in mere external relations, secured by our connection with the Church and because of which God's favor is to be enjoyed, but they are to be found in a new heart and a right life, delivered from the power and service of evil and consecrated unto God. These can only be

*See Van Oosterzee, Christian Dogmatics, Vol. 2, 740.

secured through personal union with Christ, through faith in His name. Mere participation in the Sacraments without faith, *i. e.* without the character and life which faith works in us, will not avail for our growth in grace, (for that cannot grow, which has not yet been born), nor for our acceptance and salvation.

The theory condemned in the Confession practically and virtually teaches the very reverse of this. With it, the Church consists of all, irrespective of moral or religious character, renewed or unrenewed, who are in external formal connection with it; and that the blessings of union with Christ, with all that belongs thereto, and flows therefrom, are assured and secured through the sole agency of the Sacraments, and that access to Christ is obtained through the intervening agency of the Church.

Even where Romanism admits the need of personal holiness to the attainment of salvation, it looks for, as is done by Bellarmine, in his discussions on the Sacraments, the renewing and sanctifying of the soul, not to the word and the spirit, but to the Church and the Sacraments.* It regards the Church as a visible institution, with complete apparatus and machinery for saving souls. It meets all alike with the offer and the requirement of *Baptism*, by which it not only professes and promises to secure union with Christ, but also to provide and bestow sacramental grace, *i. e.* spiritual power and life to discharge subsequent duty. It then presents the Sacrament of *Confirmation*, by which it fully equips for the spiritual warfare upon which the recipient enters. The *Eucharist* is then reached, with its declared *ex opere operato* efficacy, feeding and nourishing with Christ's body and blood all who interpose no positive bar (non ponentibus obicem). For those who have fallen, there is in readiness the very convenient sacrament of *Penance*, whose restoring virtue never fails in the hour of need. Thus is there provision for every emergency of life, and so is there also for death. The Sacrament of *Extreme Unction* places in his hand a passport to the eter-

* See Hodge's Systematic Theology, vol. 3, 511.

nal world, issued by the order and with the seal of the Church upon it. But eternal life is not yet bestowed. Confessing that this *ex opere operato* theory does not necessarily work moral changes or necessarily secure oneness with Christ and fitness for heaven, there is placed, somewhere between the grave and glory, the Sacrament of *Purgatory* for completing and perfecting the preparation of the soul for its final and unchanging condition.

There is in this arrangement, most surely, the merit of completeness. Should it ever fail in achieving its professed object, it cannot be for want of instrumentality.

COUNCIL OF TRENT ON THE SACRAMENTS.

At the seventh session of the Council of Trent, held March 3d, A. D. 1547, action was taken upon the subject of "*The Sacraments in General.*" Thirteen Canons were passed, as set forth in the preface, "in order to destroy the errors and to extirpate the heresies which have appeared in these our days on the subject of the said most holy Sacraments, as well those which have been revived from the heresies condemned of old by our Fathers, as also those newly invented, and which are exceedingly prejudicial to the purity of the Catholic Church and to the salvation of souls."

In the first of these it is "established and decreed" that the Sacraments were instituted by Christ, that they are neither more nor less than seven, and an anathema is discharged at any one who may be so daring and wicked as to declare "that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a Sacrament." Was not that *cannon* most effectually spiked by Chemnitz in his illustrious *Examen?* It has harmed no Protestant theologian since then.

Anathemas, like cannon-balls in a citadel, were provided in great abundance, and with the adoption of each successive *Canon*, one was hurled at the head of any unbelieving dissenter.

Canon II. sets forth the difference between the Sacraments of the Old and New Testaments.

Canon III. declares that these seven Sacraments are not all of equal value.

Canon IV. affirms that these Sacraments are necessary unto salvation; that the grace of justification cannot be obtained without them, although all the Sacraments are not necessary for every individual.

Canon V. anathematizes any one who may say that these Sacraments were instituted for the sake of nourishing faith alone.

Canon VI. reads as follows: "If any one saith that the Sacraments of the New Law do not contain the grace which they signify; or, that they do not confer that grace on those who do not place an obstacle thereunto; as though they were merely outward signs of grace or justice received through faith, and certain marks of the Christian profession, whereby believers are distinguished amongst men from unbelievers: let him be anathema."

Canon VII. is distinctive: "If any saith, that grace, as far as God's part is concerned, is not given through the said Sacraments, always and to all men, even though they receive them rightly, but (only) sometimes, and to some persons: let him be anathema."

Canon VIII. is also worthy of quotation: "If any one saith that by the said Sacraments of the New Law grace is not conferred through the act performed, but that faith alone in the divine promise suffices for the obtaining of grace: let him be anathema."

Canon IX. asserts that Baptism, Confirmation, and Order imprint upon the soul certain spiritual indelible signs, on account of which they cannot be repeated.

Canon X. affirms that all Christians have not power to administer the word and the Sacraments.

Canon XI. declares that when ministers effect and confer the Sacraments, the intention of doing what the Church does is required.

Canon XII. teaches that though a minister be in mortal sin, yet if he observe all the essentials which belong to the effect-

ing or conferring of the Sacrament, he effects and confers the the Sacrament.

Canon XIII. says that the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church, used in the administration of the Sacraments may not be contemned, or omitted or changed, without sin.

A more interesting, important, or timely study, than that which these thirteen Canons invite and demand, enters not into a theological course, nor arises in the longest pastorate. Conflicting opinions and theories have prevailed, and no doubt will prevail, so long as Sacraments exist. The Church ever has observed and, doubtless ever will observe these external ordinances. The questions of grace and salvation stand in closest connection therewith. Indifference, either for theologians or pastors, is impossible. Through them the faith and the life of Christians are expressed. There is possibility, if not danger, for censurable and destructive extremes, as the charges and denunciations of each age and tendency make apparent. Let there be too objective and materialistic a conception entertained, reducing the appliances of the Church to the low position of being a mere religious machinery, working its results necessarily and by the mere act performed, severing the appointed connection between morality and religion, there will be outcry loud and long, and they who persist therein must do so against the most earnest protest, and the most cogent reasonings of an alarmed and indignant Church. Should there be, on the other hand, too violent a rebound, should there be too low a value placed upon the existing and established rites of the Church, should they be shorn of all their credited efficiency, and be regarded simply as suggestive ceremonies, by which to make out and distinguish Christians and stimulate their spiritual sensibilities, as the rainbow in the heavens, or the memorial stones of the Jordan, or the pictures in our churches, there will again be most righteous indignation provoked, and believers will demand the respect and appreciation due to institutions of this high character.

Against both these false and dangerous positions has the Church of the Augsburg Confession been compelled to bear

witness. Guided alone by the sure and infallible word of God, it has taken its position advisedly and firmly, protesting alike against Rome and Rationalism, against excluding Christ from His own Church by the substitution of Sacraments multiplied at will, and the distorted interpretation or unbelieving neglect of His solemn commands and appointments.

Stimulated by the zeal, ability and achievements of the Reformers, and as is most likely, with* the original (German) copy of the Augsburg Confession, before them for examination and refutation, the enraged and indignant Doctors and Theologians at Trent, formulated their conclusions in the Canons just recited. Therein they clearly declare and maintain that the Sacraments contain the grace which they signify; that they confer grace *ex opere operato*, by the mere act, upon such as do not put an obstruction by mortal sin; that the Sacraments are equally efficacious in accomplishing their designed end: "for these sensible and natural things," it is declared," work by the almighty power of God in the Sacraments what they could not do by their own power;" that faith in the recipient in order to his experiencing the efficacy of the Sacraments is not necessary; that all that is necessary in the administrator is the intention of doing what the Church designs to be done.

EX OPERE OPERATO.

Much has grown out of the declaration that the Sacraments have an *ex opere operato* efficacy, for much is contained therein. Romanists and Protestants have explained and expounded, until what in itself is plain enough and easily understood, has become much obscured. There need be no difficulty, however, in arriving at a positive understanding. There is here propounded and affirmed what had been so relentlessly condemned in the thirteenth article of the Augsburg Confesssion. Over against that article they design, and make clear their design, to say that the Sacraments, when duly administered,

*Creeds of Christendom, Vol. I., p. 237.

invariably produce the intended results, irrespective of the moral character of the recipient. They are sufficient in themselves, and we need not look beyond them for the effect produced. It would be an easy task to bring together the masterly utterances of Lutheran and Reformed Theologians in reply to this assumption. We will not lengthen this article by such quotations, however interesting and valuable they might prove. The line of argumentation we will briefly indicate. Not only is it affirmed that it lacks authority from the sacred scriptures, which is in itself an indispensable requisite, and a most damaging defect, but that it is absolutely unscriptural, being in conflict with the Bible in its representation of saving grace, as dependent upon a Sacrament and not upon faith.

Then again it is urged against this theory, that it debases the ordinances of divine appointment, intended to influence the mind and control the affections, into a mere physical law, with no other recommendation than that it will unfailingly operate as a magical charm. The Sacraments are thus degraded to the level of heathen ignorance and superstition. It is also affirmed of this priestly device, that it is of immoral tendency, as nothing short of mortal sin can constitute a sufficient bar against the reception of the grace signified and conveyed by the Sacraments.

Another most serious and immovable objection is found in the fact, that whatever may be the design or the desire, the need or the qualifications of the recipient, it conditions the efficacy and the blessings of the Sacraments, entirely upon the intention of the administrators. For reasons like these we reject and repudiate this whole conception as alike unscriptural, unreasonable, unnatural, and unsatisfactory.

LATER DOGMATIC VIEWS.

The requirements of this occasion impose the obligation, not simply to use the article under examination as a text for an isolated discourse, as the Homiletician employs a passage of scripture, but in addition, under its lead to trace the in-

fluence it has had in forming and controlling the theology of the Church in subsequent times. We may, in some sense, regard the Augsburg Confession as a germ, which endowed with spiritual vitality, must continually increase and grow, until it has reached its utmost dimensions. It was indeed an imperishable and indestructible bud, which has opened and expanded into a most beautiful and fragrant flower. Yet it must ever be regarded as the work of uninspired and fallible men, who themselves acknowledged no human authority as final, and who are most honored, not when their utterances are credulously accepted, but when they are thoroughly examined and diligently compared with the word of God. To this, their successors and followers are ever urged, not only by their example, but also by their precept.

The history of Dogmatics in the Lutheran Church, reveals the existence of a difference in the mode of stating the efficacy of the Sacraments. There may not be in it as much as at first appears, but unquestionably the representations of our later Theologians must be regarded not only as fuller but as stronger. Dr. Heinrich Schmid, of Erlangen, in his admirable and indispensable work, "*The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*," presents the matter at considerable length, and with fairness and discrimination. "When we compare the views of the earlier Dogmaticians with those of the more modern, we find their difference to consist in this, that the earlier Dogmaticians are solely concerned to prove the analogy of the word and Sacraments, as the two means of Salvation, according to which in the one case, evangelical grace is communicated by the word, and in the other by the external, visible sign. In this view, however, there is no notice taken of the fact, that above all in the Lord's Supper, besides grace, there is something in addition present and communicated, viz., the body and blood of Christ. The later theologians, on the other hand, keep this particularly in view, that even if by the Sacraments, as well as by the word, the grace of salvation (*i. e.* conversion, justification, regeneration, etc.) is conferred, yet that this grace is not the first and proximate object conferred in the Sacraments, as it is in the

word, but that in the Sacraments there is something else which precedes it, (in the Lord's Supper, body and blood), the design of which is to impart saving grace. It is this, then, that they mean to convey by the general expression, materia cœlestis, applicable to both Sacraments, but it is difficult for them to show the materia cœlestis in Baptism, in the same way, as in the Lord's Supper. And, in this view of the subject, the force of the analogy also between a Sacrament and the word, as the two means of Salvation, is weakened. In assuming a materia cœlestis, they assumed also a particular union of the materia cœlestis et terrestis."

The manner of this union is stated by Quenstedt, (IV. 75) as follows: "As a Sacrament is composed of a terrestrial and a celestial object, there must necessarily be a certain union and κοινωνία which we properly call sacramental. For that union is neither essential, nor natural, nor accidental, but in view of the materia unita, it is extraordinary; in regard to the design it is sacramental. Therefore one does not exist without the other, for instance, water without the spirit, nor the spirit without the water, because these too are most intimately united in the sacramental act, nor can one be a Sacrament without the other."

This method of stating the doctrine seems to have been induced by the views held with regard to the Lord's Supper, as in that Sacrament, especially, is it satisfactorily verified and illustrated. Much diversity of opinion and statement prevailed as to what constitutes the celestial material in Baptism.

The most prominent and able opponent of this assumption was found in the vigorous and indefatigable Dr. Baier, "who contended that the expression, celestial material, should be entirely ignored in the doctrine of the Sacraments in general, and we should adhere to the simple doctrine of the earlier Dogmaticians, who do not mention it at all." It seems to have maintained its hold upon the great body of Lutheran Divines, as is manifest among others from the statements of Guericke, who regards the correct view of the efficacy of the Sacraments to lie nearer that of the Greek and Roman rep-

resentation, than that which is found in the Reformed theology. If Guericke be right in this supposition, so much the worse for the Reformed theology. Neither Guericke, strenuous Lutheran as he is, nor any other Lutheran, can be deterred from holding or defending the accredited doctrines of the Church, provided they be first ascertained to be the teachings of the sacred scriptures, or clear and necessary deductions therefrom, by any suspicion or charge of thereby approximating Romanism. The truth is more valuable than reputation or presumed consistency.

So long however, as it remains an undenied fact, that in each century of her existence, the Lutheran Church has demanded with firm and unanimous voice, the absolute necessity of faith in order to any real sanctifying or saving benefit being derived from the use of the Sacraments, which cuts up by the very roots the whole theory of the Romish *ex opere operato*, we may well endure the charge of occupying a higher position than others, as to our interpretation of the value and efficiency of those ordinances in which all rejoice.

Even so unLutheran a witness as Dr. C. Hodge, of Princeton, very frankly declares, that "the Lutheran definition of the Sacraments agrees in all essential points with that of the Reformed Churches." The approximation towards Rome therefore, quoted from Guericke, cannot be so close as to endanger any "*essential point.*" The same distinguished Theologians very candidly admits, that "this doctrine of salvation by faith, or as Luther has it, by faith alone, has saved the Lutheran system from the virus of ritualism."

"The Lutheran Church" says Guericke, "regards the Sacraments as actions wherein God, through external signs by Him appointed, offers and confers His invisible and heavenly gifts; they see in the Sacraments visible signs, which in virtue of the divine word of promise pronounced over them, in such sense contain the invisible divine gifts they signify that they communicate them (Mittheilen) to all who partake of them, although only to believers to their good."

The divergency between the strict Lutheran view of the efficacy of the Sacraments, and that which is set forth in the

Reformed symbols, does not displays itself at first sight. The formal definitions are so near alike as to be almost interchangeable. It is not until we come to the question, 'how, in the Sacraments, are the things signified, conveyed and applied to those who by faith worthily receive them?' does this difference appear.

If we cannot account for this difference upon the supposition of a difference of philosophic conception, if after all allowance be made for the difference of interpretation of the same language, there still remains an unresolved residuum, we cannot but ask, must there not be some definite efficacy predicated of the Sacraments? With the whole conception of a Sacrament before the mind, must we not associate with it, apart from all accessories, an effect possible, *when all the conditions are met*, such as this view indicates, so as to attain the end designed, and vindicate the propriety of its appointment? It is not limiting salvation to the Sacraments, and irrespective of possibilities, or intentions, to send all to perdition who may not be in possession or enjoyment of them, to say that the things intended by the Sacraments are secured by them and only by them. It is only to say that there was a place in Christ's kingdom for them, and that they accomplish the end for which they were appointed. We may with full comfort and assurance remit all supposable exceptions or cases of difficulty to the goodness and the wisdom of Him, who will most wonderously provide for every emergency and harmonize all apparent contradictions.

The difficulty is sometimes felt, and the objection urged, that by ascribing intrinsic efficacy to the Sacraments, we would seem to invade the province and ignore the power of the Holy Spirit.* The conflict supposed is only apparent, not real. No theory of the Sacraments can stand for a moment, that does not fully harmonize with the clear statements of the Scriptures as to the office and work either of the Father, the Son, or the Spirit. In this instance we have little difficulty in recognizing the agreement.

---

*See Hodge's Theology, vol. 3, 503 et 510.

The representations of the Symbols, and of those authorized to interpret them, are uniform in their testimony on this point. This is placed beyond cavil or quibble by the express and definite language of Article V.* of the Augsburg Confession: '*through the instrumentality of the word and Sacraments the Holy Spirit is given, who, when and where it pleases God, works faith in those who hear the Gospel.*" Equally clear and definite are the statements of the Apology and the Form of Concord. Chemnitz very emphatically declares: "The Sacraments are certainly not to be put upon an equality with the Holy Spirit, so as to be regarded as conferring grace in an equal and, in fact, an identical respect with the Holy Spirit Himself." * * "But most carefully and solicitously, when we dispute concerning the virtue and efficacy of Sacraments, must we avoid taking from God, and transferring to the Sacraments what properly belongs to the grace of the Father, *the efficacy of the Spirit*, and the merit of the Son of God; for this would be the crime of idolatry; nor are the Sacraments to be added as assisting and partial causes to the merit of Christ, the grace of the Father, and the efficacy of the Holy Spirit; for this would involve the same crime."†

"Baptism," says Gerhard, "is the washing of water in the word, by which washing the whole adorable Trinity purifieth from sin him who is baptized, not by the work wrought (*ex opere operato*), but *by the effectual working of the Holy Ghost* coming upon him, and by his own faith." After quoting the above, Dr. Krauth adds:‡ "Such is the tenor of all the definitions our Church gives of Baptism, from the simple, elementary statements of the Catechism up to the elaborate definitions of the great doctrinal systems." Dr. Krauth's exceptional familiarity with all that has been written upon this subject, and his well-known pronounced position in regard to the nature and efficacy of the Sacraments, give additional value to this testimony. Speaking of the unjust, because un-

*See Evang. Review (1870), vol. xxi., 598.

† Exam. Con. Trid. ‡Cons. Ref., p. 558.

founded, charges against our Church on this subject, he says: "She regards it, as just as absurd to refer any blessings to Baptism, *as her enemies define it*, as it would be to attribute to swords and guns the power of fighting battles without soldiers to wield them."

Sacraments are one of the agencies employed by the Holy Ghost by which to accomplish His divine work. His presence and power, in and through them, are neither denied nor ignored, but on the other hand are fully recognized and acknowledged by the Lutheran conception of a Sacrament. There can be no Sacrament without the element and the word and the Holy Spirit which unites them. Whenever, therefore, a Sacrament is administered, the entire constituency is necessarily present, else it would be no Sacrament.

It is, therefore, unjust to assert that our theologians ignore the operations of the Holy Ghost in their representations of the intrinsic efficacy of the Sacraments. There may or there may not be a special manifestation of the Holy Ghost, but this is not dependent upon the administration of the Sacrament or caused by it.

The Holy Ghost is ever present in the preaching of the word, but not always with the same demonstration. Sometimes there are pentecostal results, at others there are no results to be seen, yet it is ever the same word, armed with its own peculiar efficacy.

WHAT IS A SACRAMENT?

We are now prepared to ask and to answer the question, "What is the Church's definition of a Sacrament?" *The Apology* says very concisely: "The Sacraments are rites commanded by Christ, and to which is added the promise of grace." "A Sacrament is a ceremony or work, in which God holds out to us that which the promise annexed to the rite offers." Chemnitz, at great length and with characteristic force and clearness, lays down and defends the following particulars: "Any ordinance that is to be properly regarded as a Sacrament of the New Testament, must have the following requisites: 1. It must have an external, or corporeal and vis-

ible element or sign, which may be handled, exhibited, and used in certain external rites. 2. The element or sign, and the rite in which it is employed, must have an express divine command to authorize and sanction it. 3. It must be commanded and instituted in the New Testament. 4. It must be instituted not for a certain period or generation, but to be in force until the end of the world. 5. There must be a divine promise of grace as the effect or fruit of the Sacrament. 6. That promise must not only simply, and by itself, have the testimony of God's word, but it must by the divine ordinance be annexed to the sign of the Sacrament, and, as it were, clothed with that sign or element. 7. That promise must not relate to the general gifts of God, whether corporeal or spiritual, but it must be a promise of grace or justification, *i. e.* of gratuitous reconciliation, the remission of sins, and, in a word, of all the benefits of redemption. 8. And that promise in the Sacraments, is either signified or announced not in general only, but on the authority of God, is offered, presented, applied, and sealed to the individuals who use the Sacraments in faith."

Hutter describes it thus: "A Sacrament is a sacred rite, divinely instituted, consisting partly of an external element or sign, and partly of a celestial object, by which God not only seals the promise of grace peculiar to the Gospel (*i. e.* of gratuitous reconciliation), but also truly presents, through the external elements, to the individuals using the Sacrament, the celestial blessings promised in the institution of each of them, and also savingly applies the same to those who believe." By the grace of the Gospel is understood, "the applying grace of the Holy Spirit secured by the merit of Christ, and promised in the Gospel, namely, grace that calls, illuminates, regenerates, &c."

From Gerhard we extract the following: "A Sacrament is a sacred and solemn rite, divinely instituted, by which God through the ministry of man, dispenses heavenly gifts, under a visible and external element, through a certain word, in order to offer, apply and seal to those using them and believing, the special promise of the Gospel concerning the gratui-

tous remission of sins." Quenstedt says: "The word Sacrament is understood for the solemn rite instituted, prescribed and commanded by God, in which, by an external and visible sign, invisible benefits are graciously offered, conferred and sealed." Baier says: "A Sacrament in general may be defined as an action divinely appointed, through the grace of God, for Christ's sake, employing an external element cognizable by the senses, through which, accompanied by the words of the institution, there is conferred upon or sealed unto men the grace of the Gospel for the remission of sins unto eternal life." Hollazius defines in this manner: "A Sacrament is a sacred and solemn rite divinely instituted, by which God, by the intervening ministry of man, through an external and visible element united with the words of the institution, presents something celestial (or heavenly gifts) to the individuals participating, in order to offer to all men, and to confer upon and seal unto believers, the grace of the Gospel."

NUMBER OF SACRAMENTS.

It is a matter of surprise and congratulation, that the Reformers so quickly and so unanimously settled the question of the number of the Sacraments. They were guided by the only principle which could secure them from mistake. Dropping for the time, all that had been surmised and conjectured by the extravagant and fanciful schoolmen, they went for unerring instruction directly to the New Testament. Accepting only those which were admitted by all to be Sacraments, they sought out their essential elements or characteristics. Having thus decided what were the indispensable constituents of a Sacrament, such as are found in Baptism and the Lord's Supper, they proceeded to apply this test to all the other rites and institutions, which at one time or another had been called Sacraments.

These must have sure evidence of divine appointment. As none but God could promise grace, so none but God could appoint a sign or seal of it, or institute an ordinance that might be the means of communicating it. This is God's province and prerogative alone. They must necessarily signify grace,

as Baptism, of cleansing, renewing, regeneration, and the Lord's Supper, spiritual food, nourishment, strength, and at the same time be seals of this grace, by which those who participate in faith might be sanctified and saved. They must necessarily have the promise of grace, *i. e.* "the special promise of the gospel concerning the gratuitous remission of sins." They must also be general and perpetual in character, and applicable to all classes, conditions and generations of men, coextensive with the continuance of Christ's everlasting kingdom, from which they dare never be divorced.

Dr. Schmid, of Erlangen, says: "We cannot determine from the meaning of the word, Sacrament, *per se*, what sacred services are to rank as Sacraments, but the marks which belong to the two services, by common consent designated as Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, are examined, and all other rites are excluded from this conception of a Sacrament, which do not present similar marks. In doing this, it is not affirmed that the idea of Sacrament, *per se*, does not long belong to them, but it is maintained, that it is not applicable to them in the same sense as to the two genuine Sacraments."

In reference to this matter, Chemnitz, says: "We will not contend about the definitions of this man, or that man, of the ancients or the moderns, but we shall assume the ground which is beyond controversy and acknowledged among all. Baptism and the Eucharist are confessed by all to be truly and properly Sacraments." Baier is of similar opinion: "Thus, therefore, from the commonly received conceptions of the marks in which those rites agree, that are undoubtedly Sacraments, it is apparent that those which may perchance be called Sacraments, but have not these common requisites, are not Sacraments in the same sense and reality as those which are properly so called, but are only equivocally designated as such."

Adhering strictly and unfalteringly to this rule, it very soon became manifest that the additional five Sacraments, endorsed by the Council of Trent, could not be accepted as valid Sacraments. They all lacked one or more of the essen-

tial elements of a Sacrament as discovered in Baptism and the Eucharist.

Concerning *absolution*, however, for awhile there had been some wavering. Chemnitz admits that some of the theologians would have granted it a place among the Sacraments, "because it has the application of a general promise to the individuals using this service. But still it is certain that absolution has not an established external element, or sign, or rite, instituted or commanded of God. And although the imposition of hands, or some other external rite may be applied, yet it is certainly destitute of a special and express divine command. Nor is there any promise, that through any such external rite, God will efficaciously apply the promise of the Gospel. We have, indeed, the promise that through the word He wishes to be efficacious in believers; but in order to constitute anything a Sacrament, not only is a naked promise in the word required, but that by a divine appointment or institution, it be expressly clothed with some sign or rite divinely commanded. But the announcement or recitation of the Gospel promise is not such a sign, for in that way the general preaching of the gospel would be a Sacrament. *Therefore absolution is not properly and truly a Sacrament in the way or sense in which Baptism and the Lord's Supper are Sacraments*; but if any one, with this explanation and difference added, would wish to call it a Sacrament on account of the peculiar application of the promise, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession declares that it would not oppose the idea."

The impossibility of defending the *sacramental character* of the added five of the Council at Trent has become so apparent, that none but those acknowledging the supremacy of the Papacy, for a moment affirm it. Admitting that they may be spoken of in the New Testament as existing rites in the Church, yet every rite is not a Sacrament. However expressive and useful these ceremonies may be, they have not been associated with the promise, the sign or seal of grace, by which to apply to believers the benefits of redemption. Their design is much more limited and their application is

not universal. *Matrimony* is indeed a divine institution, but has nothing to do with applying the benefits of redemption to believers. For confirmation, penance and extreme unction, *as expounded and practiced in the Church of Rome*, we fail to find any authorization whatever in the New Testament. As now existing, they were not instituted by Christ but by man. Concerning *ordination* as a Sacrament, it may be remarked, that it was never claimed by the Apostles, nor affirmed of them in the New Testament, that they conferred other than miraculous power. They did not possess, nor did they claim the power of conferring, the sanctifying and saving influences of the Holy Ghost. Much less is it declared or implied that apostolic gifts were designed to be perpetuated in the Church.

Can it be for a moment supposed, that if Christ intended such an array of ordinances to be associated with the bestowment of grace, nearly *twelve* centuries should be permitted to pass before it should be discovered, and four more before the Church of Christ should be certified of it?

The relation of the Sacraments to the growth of *ritualism*, and to the development of the *hierarchy*, is so intimate, that we can easily understand why they were multiplied. *Protestantism* could not have done what it has thus far achieved, nor would it to-day be the power it has become, had it accepted the perversions of Rome on this subject. We owe it to the Gospel, and to the heroic achievments of that second heralding of it, to guard with unsleeping vigilance all our teachings concerning the Sacraments.

At this point, it may be a matter of interest to place in juxtaposition, the several authorized formal definitions of a Sacrament.

1. *The Apology* (1530) says: "If we regard as Sacraments the external signs and ceremonies, which God enjoined, and with which He connected the promise of grace, it is easy to determine what are sacraments; for ceremonies and other external things, instituted by men, are not Sacraments in this sense; because men cannot promise the grace of God without authority. Signs, therefore, which are instituted without

the command of God, are not signs of grace; although they may be memorials to children and to the ignorant, like a painted cross."

2. *The first Helvetic Confession* (1536) says: "Sacraments are not only tokens of human fellowship, but also pledges of the grace of God, by which the ministers do work together with the Lord, to that end, which He doth promise, offer and bring to pass; yet so, as we said before of the ministry of the word, that all the saving power is to be ascribed to the Lord alone." "Sacraments are visible patterns, instituted by God, of the grace, good will, and promises of God towards us; sure testimonies, and holy remembrances, the which under earthly signs do represent unto us, and set before our eyes, heavenly gifts, and do withdraw the mind from earthly to heavenly things. Moreover, they be tokens of Christian brotherhood and fellowship. Therefore, a Sacrament is not only a sign; but it is made up of two things, to wit, of a visible or earthly sign, and of the thing signified, which is heavenly; the which two, although they make but one Sacrament, yet it is one thing which is received with the body, another thing which the faithful mind being taught by the Spirit of God, doth receive."

3. *The French Confession of Faith* (1559) says: "We believe that the Sacraments are added to the word for more ample confirmation, that they may be to us pledges and seals of the grace of God, and by this means aid and comfort our faith, because of the infirmity which is in us, and that they are outward signs through which God operates by His Spirit, so that He may not signify anything to us in vain. Yet we hold that their substance and truth is in Jesus Christ, and that of themselves they are only smoke and shadow."

4. *The Scotch Confession of Faith* (1560) says: "We acknowledge and confess, that we have two chief Sacraments only, instituted by the Lord Jesus and commanded to be used of all those that will be reputed members of His body; to wit, Baptism, and the Supper or Table of the Lord Jesus, called the Communion of His body and His blood. These Sacraments * * not only do make a visible difference,

betwixt His people and those that were without His league, but also do exercise the faith of His children, and, by participation of the same Sacraments, do seal in their hearts the assurance of His promise and of that most blessed conjunction, union and society, which the elect have with their head, Christ Jesus. And thus, we utterly condemn the vanity of those that affirm Sacraments to be nothing else but naked and bare signs."

5. *The Belgic Confession* (1561), Article 33, says: "We believe that our gracious God, on account of our weakness and infirmities, hath ordained the Sacraments for us, thereby to seal unto us His promises, and to be pledges of the goodwill and grace of God towards us, and also to nourish and strengthen our faith; which He hath joined to the word of the Gospel, the better to present to our senses, both that which He signifies to us by His word, and that which He works inwardly in our hearts, thereby assuring and confirming in us the salvation which He imparts to us. For they are visible signs and seals of an inward and invisible thing, by means whereof God worketh in us by the power of the Holy Ghost. Therefore the signs are not in vain or insignificant, so as to deceive us. For Jesus Christ is the true object presented by them, without whom they would be of no moment."

6. *The Heidelberg Catechism* (1563), Question 66, says: "The Sacraments are visible, holy signs and seals, appointed of God for this end, that by the use thereof He may the more fully declare and seal to us the promise of the Gospel; namely, that He grants us out of free grace the forgiveness of sins and everlasting life, for the sake of the one sacrifice of Christ, accomplished on the cross."

7. *The Church of England* (1563), in Article 25, says; "Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him."

8. *The Second Helvetic Confession*, (1566) Chapter 19, says: "Sacraments be mystical symbols, or holy rites, or sacred actions, ordained of God Himself, consisting of His word, of outward signs, and of things signified; whereby He keepeth in continual memory, and eftsoons (from time to time) recalleth to mind, in His Church, His great benefits bestowed upon man; and whereby He sealeth up His promises, and outwardly representeth, and, as it were, offereth unto our sight, those things which inwardly He performeth unto us, and therewithal strengtheneth and increaseth our faith through the working of God's Spirit in our hearts; lastly, whereby He doth separate us from all other people and religions, and consecrateth and bindeth us wholly unto Himself, and giveth us to understand what He requireth of us."

9. *The Irish Articles of Faith* 1615) say: "The Sacraments ordained by Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather certain sure witness and effectual or powerful signs of grace and God's good will toward us, by which He doth work invisibly in us, and not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him."

10. *The Westminster Confession of Faith* (1647) says: "Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace, immediately instituted by God, to represent Christ and His benefits, and to confirm our interest in Him, as also to put a visible difference between those that belong unto the Church and the rest of the world; and solemnly to engage them to the service of God in Christ according to His word."

11. *The Westminster Shorter Catechism* (1647) says: "A Sacrament is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ; wherein, by sensible signs, Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are represented, sealed and applied to believers."

12. *The Confession of the Waldenses* (1655) says: "We believe that God does not only instruct us by His word, but has also ordained certain Sacraments to be joined with it, as means to unite us to Jesus Christ, and to make us partakers of His benefits; and that there are only two of them belonging in common to all the members of the Church under the New Testament, to wit, Baptism and the Lord's Supper."

12. *The Methodist Episcopal Articles of Religion* (1784) say: "Sacraments ordained of Christ are not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they are certain signs of grace, and God's good will toward us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him."

ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS.

A very important branch of our examination presents itself in the question of the public administration of these sacred ordinances. In what manner and under what circumstances are they to be employed?

They were given by Christ not to individuals, for special personal use, nor yet to the Apostles as a particular class, but to them as the first public functionaries of the Gospel, as its heralds. "*Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*" Matt. 28 : 19.

"*As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death till He come.*" 1 Cor. 11 : 26.

It must needs be that upon all questions pertaining to the doctrines and the ordinances of the Church, the Apostles received vastly more personal and official instruction than stands written in the brief gospel narrative. That which is essential and which is necessary to legitimate their teachings and their actions, is recorded. For their guidance in all doubtful cases, and for their preservation from all error, the promise was given them, that the Holy Ghost should bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever Christ had said unto them.* Since their day, as the result of their example and teaching, the administration of the Sacraments have been regarded as belonging primarily and principally to the Church in her organized capacity, and to her regularly chosen and appointed ministers. There seems to be no room for doubt that as the necessities of the case require, so it was intended to perpetuate an order of men in the Church who

*John 14 : 26.

should preach the word and administer the Sacraments. Either theoretically or practically, this has been held and taught in every age and by every branch of the Church.

To constitute a ceremony or ritual in public worship a Sacrament, it must not only be divinely appointed, but it must be used for a designated end, and administered according to prescribed order. We have no more command over the purpose or the manner of observance than of the matter, in so far as the manner may have been divinely instituted. Hafenreffer very justly remarks: "It is specially required that in each Sacrament *the whole action*, as instituted and ordained by Christ, should be observed; neither is the use of the Sacraments to be applied to foreign ends and objects. Hence, the rule: 'Nothing has the authority or nature of a Sacrament beyond the application and act instituted by Christ. *E. g.*, if the water of baptism be employed for the baptism of bells, or for the cure of leprosy; or when the consecrated bread is not distributed and taken, but is either deposited in the pyx, or offered in sacrifice, or carried about in processions, this is not the use, but the abuse and profanation of the Sacraments." According to Hollazius: "God has intrusted the right of dispensing the Sacraments of the Church, which commits the execution or exercise of this right, for the sake of order and propriety, to the called and ordained ministers of the Gospel. But in case of extreme necessity, where the Sacrament is necessary and could not be omitted without peril of salvation, any Christian, male or female, may validly administer the Sacrament of Baptism or initiation." Have such cases of extreme necessity ever occurred, or can they even be imagined?

VALIDITY AND VALUE OF THE SACRAMENTS.

The relation of the character and intention of the administrator to the validity and efficacy of the Sacraments, has ever been regarded as an interesting and important inquiry. The Apology says: "the Sacraments are efficacious, even if they be administered by wicked ministers, because the ministers officiate in the stead of Christ, and do not represent

their own person." Quenstedt, says; "the Sacraments do not belong to the man who dispenses them, but to God, in whose name they are dispensed, and therefore the gracious efficacy and operation of the Sacrament depend on God (1 Cor. 3 : 5), and not on the character or quality of the minister. The dispute about *the intention* of the minister is more intricate. Propriety requires that he, who administers the Sacraments, should bring to the altar a good intention of performing what God has commanded and instituted; a mind not wandering, but collected and fixed. It is *absolutely necessary* that the intention of Christ be observed *in the external act.* I say in the *externat act*, for the intention of the minister to perform the internal act is not necessary; that is performed by the Church. On the other hand, the Church of Rome teaches that the intention of the minister is necessary to the integrity, verity and efficacy of the Sacrament; that this intention has respect, not only to the external act of administering the Sacrament according to the form of institution, but to the design and effect of the Sacrament itself. Thus the Council of Trent: 'If any one declares, that the intention of doing what the Church does, is not required in the ministers whilst they dispense the Sacraments, let him be anathematized.' "

We may well rejoice, that the more rational, and we believe, more scriptural representations of the reformers on this subject, delivers us from all the uncertainties of the unknown intention of the officiator. For, with all grace locked up in the Sacraments—with their efficacy and validity dependent entirely upon the undeclared will and purpose of the administrator, who can know whether his own baptism was rightly performed, or whether he has ever once really received the saving efficacy of the Lord's Supper?

The salvation of every member of the Church of Rome, from Pope Leo XIII to the last one that has participated in its, ordinances is placed upon the uncertain condition of the right intention of its clergy. Could anything more imperil one's safety or more increase the power of the priesthood?

Without any such precarious and profitless power at com-

mand, the administrator, according to Protestantism, has the high and honorable prerogative of *consecrating* the elements, *i. e.* of separating them from a common to a sacred use, which he accomplishes by reciting and pronouncing the words of the institution. Gerhard describes it thus: "The consecration is not (1) a mere recitation of the words of the institution directed only to the *hearers*, nor (2) is the change of symbols, which consecration effects, a mere change of names, a significative analogy, a representation of an absent celestial thing * * * but it is a sacred and efficacious action, by which the Sacramental symbols are truly sanctified, *i. e.* separated from a common and set apart for a Sacramental use. But there is no (*a*) magical superstitious action dependent on the dignity or quality of the person, *i. e.* on the power and character of the minister who renders the Sacraments valid by the force of his intention; nor (*b*) is it to be thought that there is a certain occult subjective power in the sound or number of words, by which the consecration is accomplished; (*c*) nor that by it the external elements are essentially changed and transubstantiated into the res cœlestis; but the presence of the res cœlestis and its union with the res terrena, depend altogether upon the institution, command and will of Christ, and upon the efficacy of the original institution, continuing in the Church even until the present day, which the minister, or rather Christ Himself by the voice of the minister, continually repeats. The minister, therefore, in the consecration, (1) repeats the primitive institution of the Sacrament according to the command of Christ; (2) he testifies that he does this not of his own accord, nor celebrates a human ordinance, but, as the divinely appointed steward of the mysteries, he administers the venerable Sacrament in the name, authority and place of Christ; (3) he invokes the name of the true God, that it may please him to be efficacious in this Sacrament according to His ordinance, institution and promise; (4) he separates the external elements from all other uses to a sacramental use, that they may be organs and means by which celestial benefits may be dispensed."

In order, therefore, that the administrator may rightfully

perform his official work, and his act become a valid Sacrament, he must use the divine ordinance for the purpose for which it was instituted, and in the way in which it was appointed. Over these he has no control, nor do his personal peculiarities exert any influence.

Whether he, subjectively, believes in the divine appointment of the Sacraments or not, whether he understands their meaning or not, whether he has full intention, or no intention, to secure to the recipient the spiritual blessings designed to be conveyed thereby, can in no wise affect the validity or the value of the ordinance, or destroy or diminish its efficiency. The Sacraments are of God, not of man. Their vitality resides in their divine appointment, and not in their human administration. They have been committed to the Church for the spiritual comfort and benefit of God's true children, who cannot be deprived of their priceless advantages by the unfitness, incompetency, or perverseness of unworthy officials.

This does not, however, require in the administration of the Sacraments absolute uniformity of manner. As Hollazius has well remarked: "the Church cannot change anything in the *substantials* of the Sacraments, yet she rejoices in the liberty of making some change in the *circumstantials.*" The posture of the recipient *e. g.* is not regulated either by command of Christ, or by canon of the Church. The frequency of administration is not indicated by statute. The method of the distribution of the elements in the Eucharist, or of applying the water in Baptism, is nowhere prescribed.

The moral character of the recipient, however, is all important. His personal condition either of faith or unbelief, of uprightness or sin, controls and modifies the results of the participation either for grace or condemnation.

CONFLICTING TENDENCIES.

In regard to the Sacraments, we find in every age of the Christian Church, two conflicting tendencies, the result of two opposing theories. By some, the disposition exists to overestimate, and by others, to undervalue. The results are alike lamentable and destructive. They are based upon two

grand underlying peculiarities of man's mind. The one may be characterized as material, the other as spiritual, the one is largely matter-of-fact, the other mainly poetical, the one ever looking without itself for help, for a firm resting place, the other self-conscious and self-confident, looks rather to its own capacities and resources, the one readily admits authority and accepts subjection, that it may be freed from responsibility and from uncertainty, the other resists all assumed control and prescribed order, that it may gratify its innate love for liberty, and its earnest longings for independence, the one delights in a luxurious ritual, a spectacular display, an imposing ceremonial, the other disowns and despises mere external display and rejoices in the power to lift the spirit out of the thraldom and dependence upon base matter.

The mission of the Gospel, as delivered a second time by the Reformers, is well adapted to mediate between these, to hold and cherish what is true and right and good in each, and by dropping the excesses and extremes of both, to secure that which is most scriptural and therefore most needed, and best calculated to develop spiritual life and godliness.

It is matter of clear demonstration, and may be easily verified by any who will make honest examination, that the Reformers, and especially those whose views and writings gave form and direction to the development of the Lutheran faith and cultus, and whose opinions we have already largely quoted, that whilst they always accepted with unquestioning faith and child-like simplicity the clear word of God, and always held in highest reverence and esteem the divinely appointed ordinances as co-ordinate means of grace, they never represented these latter as the only and indispensable channels for conveying to men the benefits of Christ's redemption. They had studied too long and too thoroughly those Scriptures, which without, indeed, the form and order of scholastic or scientific theology, yet with the clearness and authority of inspiration, set forth the way of life as including repentance, faith, a pure heart, and a right life. The place and agency and indispensable value of the Sacraments, are recognized, confessed and enjoined. But that the gospel scheme is em-

braced in a mere set of ceremonies, which work irresistibly, by their own inherent power, as drugs and medicines upon the body, they never taught and our Church has never believed. Yet to this does the Romish theory of the Sacraments degrade it. To this does ritualism, of any name, conduct it. The most diligent study of the Bible, and fidelity to its teachings, are as much needed to-day, as at any former day, to rescue the Church from this dangerous tendency and to prevent a return to this spiritual enslavement. Apostolic teaching and apostolic example must be produced, and set over against the speculations of visionary mystics or ambitious churchmen. The genius of Christianity must be discovered and boldly opposed to the decisions of ecclesiastical conclaves. It must be declared with all plainness, that this so-called "*sacramental theory*" cuts the very sinews of true piety and personal godliness. It secures salvation of its own unaided power, and, as is seen in the practical workings of it, there may be a glittering religiousness (that is churchliness) without any moral rectitude. The extent to which this principle may mislead and destroy, can only be rightly appreciated when we read its doings in the sad decline of "the dark ages," and hear its true spirit in the ring of money which fell into Tetzel's treasury, as the price of sins deliberately planned and to be as deliberately perpetrated.

INFANT BAPTISM.

The strict application of the principle that faith is necessary the attainment of the full efficacy of the Sacraments, as Luther says, "without faith Baptism profits nothing," would seem to invalidate the argument for Infant Baptism, which is held and practiced in all our churches. The force of this objection is of sufficient magnitude to demand examination. The opponents of Infant Baptism use it constantly, as it presents a plausible reason for their position.

The question for infant membership, and the scriptural authority to bestow upon the children of believers the rite of Baptism, have been fully and ably discussed in the Lecture

on Article IX., to which we refer. We do not propose to reproduce that argument, as our theme neither demands nor would justify it. The same remark applies with equal pertinence to the intensely interesting and much disputed question of "Baptismal Regeneration," a very full discussion of which may be found in *Evang. Rev.* vol. viii., p. 303—354. We desire only to show that this objection has no real foundation, and that our theory and practice are in perfect harmony.

When Christ instituted the ordinance of Baptism, its grand design and application were unquestionably for adults. It could not be otherwise. The Apostles were the only confessed and recognized members of His kingdom. All others were yet without. The phraseology, the instructions and the requirements of this institution, clearly indicate this purpose. As in Paradise the human race began with adults, and every arrangement contemplated adult life, so in the founding of the Christian Church, its membership began with adults, and all its arrangements primarily contemplated adult spiritual life. But as the first creation included, and when necessity arose, disclosed full provision for infant life, so also in the Christian Church is there found full provision for the spiritual necessities of children, placed there by the unerring wisdom and grace of its founder. Adult membership carries with it the necessity to provide, in some way or other, for the relation of the children of believers. The absence of all command or intimation that the relation established and disclosed in the Old Testament would be abolished, or in any wise vitiated by the New Testament, compels its continuance. Nothing short of the authority of Him who appointed it, can change or annul it. Without further formal command it remained, standing not, we conscientiously and firmly believe, and our Church strongly holds, in opposition, but in positive agreement, with all the requirements of this ordinance. It completes the idea of an initial ordinance, demanding faith of all who in adult life ask for admission, and disclosing its arrangements for securing the blessings of the

covenant to all their household: "*The promise is unto you and to your children.*"

Of necessity, therefore, the primary type and the full idea of Baptism must be sought for as it can only fully be seen, in adult Baptism, for that precedes and includes the right of infant Baptism.

It is thus that it is ordinarily and historically brought before us in the records of the New Testament, and thus that in all subsequent missionary movements it presents itself.*

That everything embraced in the sacramental idea as pertaining to the Baptism of an adult may not apply to the Baptism of an infant, neither demands nor justifies its exclusion from what is common to both. The defence of infant membership is not placed upon this ground. Its lawfulness and obligation rest, we believe, upon the positive representations of the Bible, and the unvarying examples of God's true followers in every age as therein recorded.

The idea of the Sacrament, therefore, which contemplates infant as well as adult membership, must not be so limited in its interpretation and application, as to exclude either of those for whom it is intended. Its requirements being controlled by the circumstances of its subjects, the principle remains inviolate, that, notwithstanding the baptism of infants, faith is the condition of its efficacy.

Dr. Schmid says: "The objection of the opponents, viz., 'the Sacraments are of no advantage without faith, but infants have no faith,' is considered untenable, for faith is taken into the account only in the case of adults, who are already capable of being influenced by the word."

DEFECTIVE ESTIMATE.

It may not be amiss, before closing this article, to deplore the confusion of ideas so largely prevailing in many Christian communities in regard to the value and efficacy of the Sacraments, and the little regard bestowed upon their observance.

---

*See The Reformers and The Theology of the Reformation. Cunningham, 244.

We cannot resist the temptation nor forego the pleasure of presenting the following beautiful extract from the Commentary of Rev. Jean Daillé, minister of the French Reformed Church at Charenton, A. D. 1639. Col. 2 : 12, "The Sacraments of Christ are not vain and hollow pictures in which the benefits of His death and resurrection are nakedly portrayed, as in a piece of art which gives us merely an unprofitable view of what it represents.

They are effectual means, which He accompanies with His virtue and fills with His grace; effectively accomplishing those things in us by His heavenly power, which are set before us in the Sacrament, when we receive it as we ought. He inwardly nourishes, by the virtue of His flesh and blood, the soul of him who duly takes His bread and His cup. He washes and regenerates that man within, who is rightly consecrated by Baptism.

And if the infirmity of infancy prevents the effect from appearing at the instant in children baptized, yet His virtue does not fail to accompany His institution, to preserve itself in them, and to bring forth its fruits upon them in their season, when their nature is capable of the operations of understanding and will."

With many, the plausible but superficial statements that no good can come from a mere external ceremony, and that all true piety is seated in the heart and not in outward forms, suffice to set aside positive enactments and commanded duties. Not only is there either entire ignorance, or more culpable neglect, of the place and value of these divinely appointed ordinances, but there is profane disregard of the mind and will of Christ, expressed under circumstances the most solemn and impressive. The acknowledgment of the gospel histories as of canonical authority, and the belief in the divine appointment of the Church, necessitate the acceptance of these ordinances as the only authenticated means for maintaining and perpetuating its existence. Disregard and neglect involve a grave responsibility, and expose to unmeasured risk and injury. Those placed beyond their reach, or dying without a knowledge of them, will not

be judged with the same exacting severity, "*For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required.*" Luke 12 : 48. God will deal with extraordinary cases in an extraordinary manner.

But as for those who hear the word, there can be no salvation without faith, so as to those who have access to the Sacraments, there will be no other means afforded for obtaining whatever these are appointed to convey. There can be no question that "*the necessity of precept,*" as it is called by the Theologians, exists in the positive words of their appointment; neither should there be any doubt of "*the necessity of means;*" not an absolute indissoluble necessity, as though God would limit His omnipotence to a single agency, or the bestowment of His Holy Spirit to a single channel,* but that having given an appointed instrumentality, and having neither promised nor revealed any other, we are shut up thereto, for as Jesus said: "*If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead;*" or as the apostle Paul writes: "*Before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.*"

We cannot be saved without faith, yet faith in itself does not save us, it is only the subjective condition under which alone the work of Christ becomes efficacious in our behalf. Eternal life is promised to the believing, but the believing will show their faith by their works, by their use of the means of grace and obedience to the words of Christ: "*faith which worketh by love,*" Gal. 5 : 6. Hollazius, on this subject, says: "The Sacraments are necessary by the necessity of the precept and the means. They have no absolute, but an ordinate or conditionate necessity." Quenstedt, says: "Baptism is necessary in infants, not only by the necessity of the precept, but by the necessity of the means, because there is no other means by which they may be regenerated; but in

*Luther says: "God has not bound Himself to the Sacraments, so as not to be able to do otherwise, without the Sacrament. So I hope that the good and gracious God, has something good in view for those who, not by any guilt of their own, are unbaptized."

adults it is necessary by reason of the precept, because in that case it requires faith. The Eucharist is necessary to all Christian adults, by the necessity of the precept."

Correct views of the value and efficacy of the Sacraments will ever more and more tend to elevate them in our esteem; will show in clearer light, the wisdom and the grace of their appointment. Under ordinary circumstances, we can as little dispense with them as with the Word. They are from the same gracious Lord, and for the same gracious purpose. A scriptural view of them, and an evangelical use of them cannot but work our salvation.

Chemnitz says: "the Sacraments, which God Himself instituted to be aids to our Salvation, can in no way be considered either useless or superfluous, or be safely neglected and despised. God who is rich in mercy * * * desires to present His grace to us not only in one way, that is by His mere word, but He desires also to help our infirmity by certain aids, namely by Sacraments, instituted and annexed to the promise of the Gospel, *i. e.* by certain signs, rites or ceremonies, obvious to the senses, that by them He might admonish, instruct or make us sure that what we see performed in a visible manner, externally, is effected internally in us by the power of God.

In this way the Sacraments are, in respect to us, signs confirming our faith in the promise of the Gospel; in respect to God, they are organs or instruments, through which God in the word presents, applies, seals, confirms, increases, and preserves the grace of the gospel promise in believers."

Their beneficial effects are by no means to be limited to those only who participate in them. Their influence reaches as far as their observance may be seen or known. As Hollazius says: "The secondary designs of the Sacraments are: (*a*) That they may be marks of the Church, by which it is distinguished from unbelievers" ("and symbols of confession by which we separate ourselves from other sects." Quen.) (*b.*) That they may be monuments of the benefits of Christ, Luke 22 : 18. (*c.*) That they may be bonds of love, and the nerves of public assemblies, Eph. 4 : 5 ; 1 Cor. 10 : 17. (*d.*)

That they may be incitements to the excercise of the virtues, (Baptism signifies the burying of the old Adam, Rom. 6 : 4: the Lord's Supper excites us to a grateful remembrance of the death of Christ, 1 Cor. 11: 26.)"

In all the wide range of theological inquiry, there is none more important or more interesting than that of the Sacraments. In the whole course of pastoral administration, there is no duty more impressive or more promising, and in the whole history of Christian experience there is nothing more central, more vital.

Beyond all others, does it become the ministry and membership of our own historical Church, to be true to the spirit and genius of the Reformers in regard to the estimate they placed upon the Sacraments. Therein emphatically should we grasp their spirit and imitate their example. More than in any other particular do we therein find the individuality of our Confession. Thereby especially may we hope to understand our capabilities as a Church, and by rising to proper self-consciousness, and then to a proper self-appreciation, we may attempt to influence others, by wielding the power of a compact organization, armed with the omnipotence of divine truth, in behalf of the unifying of the Church and the conversion of the world.

Shall it not be that in this, we may at last recognize our true mission among the discordant influences and dangerous tendencies by which we are surrounded? Holding fast with Luther's persistency to Luther's protestantism, as crystalized in his guiding and controlling principle of "*Justification by* faith," we shall be able to retain whatever is vital in our Church-life, notwithstanding the violent changes of outward form and of internal organization to which we may be exposed.

The truest and worthiest manifestation of gratitude to God, and loyalty to the Church, is to bestow a believing appreciation upon these priceless means of grace, and ever to make a reverent use of them. Then shall we "*grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To Him be glory, both now and forever, Amen,*" 2 Peter, 3 : 18.

ARTICLE VIII.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

AMERICAN.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*Earthly Suffering and Heavenly Glory*, by Rev. H. A. Boardman; *The Intermediate World*, by L. T. Townsend, D. D., Prof. in Boston University, author of "Credo," etc.; *The Valley of the Shadow*, Eight Sermons on the Doctrine of Future Punishment, by Chas. H. Hall, D. D.; *The Theological Trilemma*, the Three-fold Question of Endless Misery, Universal Salvation, or Conditional Immortality (*i. e.* the Survival of the Fittest), considered in the light of Revelation, by Rev. J. H. Pettingel, A. M.; *Human Life and its Conditions*, Sermons preached before the University of Oxford in 1876—78, with three Ordination Sermons, by R. W. Clinch, M. A., D. C. L., Dean of St. Paul's; *The Destiny of the Soul*, a Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, by Wm. R. Alger—tenth Edition, with six new chapters and a Complete Bibliography of the Subject, comprising 4,977 books relating to the Nature, Origin, and destiny of the Soul, etc., by Ezra Abbott, librarian of Harvard College, 8vo., pp. 914; *The Science of Revealed Truth Impregnable*, as shown by the Argumentative Failure of Infidelity and Theoretical Geology, a Course of Lectures to the Rutgers (N. J.) Theological Seminary, by W. R. Gordon, S. T. B., author of "The Supreme Godhead of Christ," etc.; *Studies in the Creative Week*, by G. D. Boardman; *Christ, His Nature and Work*, a Series of Discourses, by Drs. Howard Crosby, Bellows, Chapin, Foss, Anderson, Bevan, Armitage, Robinson, etc.; *Conditional Immortality*, plain Sermons on a Topic of Present Interest, by Wm. R. Huntington, D. D., Rector of All Saints' Church, Worcester.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*Tropical Nature, and Other Essays*, by A. R. Wallace; *Visions, a Study of False Sight* (*Pseudopia*), by Ed. H. Clarke, with a Biographical Sketch, by O. W. Holmes; *Studies in Spectrum Analysis* (Inter. Scientific Series), by J. N. Lockyer; *Magnetic Variations in the United States*, being a Compilation of Observations made in America from the Year 1640 to the Present Date, tabulated and arranged for the Use of Surveyors, by J. B. Stone; *Insanity in Ancient and Modern Life*, with Chapters on its Prevention, by D. L. Tuke, London.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*The Voyage and Adventures of Vasco da Gama*, (Young Folks' Series) illustrated, by Geo. M. Towle;

Memoir of William Francis Bartlett, by Francis Winthrop Palfrey; *Life of Pius IX.*, by J. R. G. Hassard, (Cath. Pub. Soc.); *Memoir of Jean Francois Marmontel*, with an Essay by D. W. Howells; *The War in the East*, an Illustrated History of the Conflict between Russia and Turkey, with a Review of the Eastern Question, by Prof. A. J. Schem, Assistant Superintendent of the Public Schools, New York city.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*A Study of Milton's Paradise Lost*, by J. A. Himes, A. M., Prof. of English Language and Literature in Pennsylvania College; *Studio, Field, and Gallery*, a Manual of Painting for the Student and Amateur, with information for the General Reader, by Horace J. Rollin; *An Attempt to Determine the Chronological Order of Shakespeare's Plays*, (The Harness Essay, 1877), by Rev. H. P. Stokes; *Charlotte Cushman*, Her Letters and Memories of Her Life, by Emma Stebbins; *The Young Pastor and His People*, bits of Practical Advice to Young Clergymen by Distinguished Ministers, edited by B. F. Liepner, A. M., Introduction by Hon. J. T. Headley; *Current Discussions*, a Collection from the Chief English Essays on Questions of the Time, edited by E. L. Burlingame, (vol. II. Questions of Belief): *The Indian Question*, by Elwells S. Otis, Liet.-Col. U. S. A.

GERMAN.

BIBLICAL.—*Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, by Prof. Dr. C. F. Keil. 621 pp. The author is best known by his writings on the O. T. He is a Lutheran and vigorously combats the views of negative criticism. He rejects the view that our Gospel of Matthew is based on an original Hebrew Gospel.

Of Meyer's critical exegetical Commentary on the N. T., the sixth edition of the *Commentary on Mark and Luke* has been edited by Dr. B. Weiss. 608 pp. The changes of the editor are numerous, and are so woven into the text that they cannot be distinguished from the work of the author.

Rev. W. Bahnsen is preparing an explanation of the Pastoral Epistles. That on *Second Timothy* has appeared. He tries to prove that these Epistles were written in the first half of the second century by a Pauline writer. The title of the Commentaries is: "The so-called Pastoral Letters explained."

Introduction to the New Testament, by Prof. Dr. M. von Aberle. 311 pp. The author was one of the most eminent Catholic theologians of the age. His lectures on the subject of this volume were edited after his death by Prof. Dr. P. Schanz. In the latter part of his life the author devoted himself specially to the study of the Jewish and Roman history at the beginning of our era, a study which aided him greatly in the preparation of this Introduction.

Theology of the Prophets of the O. T., by Prof. Dr. H. Zschokke. 624 pp. This author is also a Catholic. He is more liberal in his views than most Catholic theologians, and shows a high appreciation of the results of Protestant scholarship.

On the *Laws in the Pentateuch*, Dr. D. Hoffmann has published a small volume, 92 pp.

New Contributions for the Explanation of the Gospels by means of the Talmud and Midrasch, by Dr. A. Wuensche. 566 pp. The book is in the line of the works of Lightfoot, Schœttgen and Wetstein, and gathers material from the Jewish sources mentioned, for the purpose of explaining the Gospels.

The Sense of the terms Flesh and Spirit in the Bible, by Dr. H. H. Wendt. 219 pp. The author first investigates the use of these terms in the O. T. But the greater part of the book is devoted to the discussion of the terms as used by Paul.

SYSTEMATIC.—*The Conscience*, by Prof. M. Kæhler. Vol. I. 838 pp. In this volume the author discusses the idea of Conscience among the Greeks and Romans, and among the Jews who were under Hellenistic influence; also the use of the word in the N. T. The idea of Conscience in the Christian Church, and the discussion of the Conscience itself, are yet to follow. The author has made a specialty of this subject, and is very thorough.

Evangelical Lutheran Dogmatics of the Seventeenth Century, by Rev. Dr. Schulze. Third vol. 249 pp. This volume completes the work and treats of the Order of Salvation, the Means of Grace, Eschatology, and the Doctrine of the Church. The chief sources of the author are Quenstedt and Hollazius. The work is of a popular character.

Christian Dogmatics according to Protestant Principles, by Dr. A. Sweizer. 2 vols. 437 and 610 pp. Second edition. The changes in this edition are considerable.

APOLOGETICS.—In the department of Apologetics we find the following:

The Investigation of Nature and the Bible in their Relation to Creation. An empirical criticism of the Mosaic account of Creation, by Dr. C. Guettler. 343 pp.

The Biblical Account of Creation and its Relation to the Results of Natural Science, by Prof. Dr. H. Reusch. 197 pp.

The Relation of the Bible and Natural Science, by G. Zart. 118 pp.

History of the Relation Existing Between Theology and Natural Science, with Special Reference to the History of Creation, by Prof. Dr. O. Zoeckler. First Part, treating of this History from the beginning of the Christian Church to the time of Newton and Leibnitz. 779 pp.

HISTORICAL.—*Tertullian's Life and Writings*, by Rev. A. Hauck. 410 pp. A learned work, the result of much research.

Peter D'Ailly, by Dr. P. Tschackert. 435 pp. The period embraced

in this biography, the close of the fourteenth, and beginning of the fifteenth century, is important in connection with the work preparatory to the Reformation. D'Ailly acted a conspicuous part in the ecclesiastical affairs of his day, especially in France. The author devotes special attention to his relation to the reformatory councils of Pisa and Constance.

History of the Vatican Council, by J. Friedrich. Vol. I. 840 pp. This large volume only gives a history of the preparation for the Council. It treats of the preparation for the Council by the formation of an ultramontane party in France, and of a new ultramontane party in Germany and Switzerland; it treats also of the special means used to prepare for the Council, and of the calling of the Council itself. The author is a Catholic. The entire work promises to be very voluminous.

The Gustavus Adolphus Association according to its History, its Constitution and its Works, by Dr. K. Zimmermann. 339 pp. Dr. Z. was the man who did the most for this important Association. His whole heart was in the cause, and this book was written to promote its welfare. The book is posthumous, being edited by the son of the author.

The following relate to the Reformation and the work preparatory thereto:

The Reformation of King Sigismund, by F. Reiser, edited by Dr. W. Boehm. 260 pp.

King Sigismund and the Imperial Wars against the Hussites, by Dr. F. Bezold. Third part, including the years 1428—1431. 176 pp.

The Zürich Anabaptists during the Reformation, by Rev. E. Egle. 104 pp.

Memmingen During the Reformation, by F. Dobel. 251 pp.

Wittenberg under the Elector Frederick The Wise, by K. Schmidt. 62 pp.

Melanchthon, by H. W. J. Thiersch. An address. 36 pp.

J. H. W. S.

ARTICLE IX.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Whilst the past three months have not been very prolific in new publications, we have the pleasure of noticing an unusual number of works from Lutheran authors. It seems as if the pens of Lutherans had been specially active, and they have furnished valuable additions to our reading matter.

JAMES YOUNG, BALTIMORE, MD.

Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry. By John G. Morris. pp. 630. 1878.

This volume, which had been promised by the distinguished author, was anxiously waited for, and will now be hailed with peculiar satisfaction by many readers in the Lutheran Church, and doubtless by many of other Churches. The fathers of our Lutheran Church have gradually disappeared, and the links which unite the present with former generations are rapidly being severed. But little has been done to preserve, in print, the memories and deeds of those who, during the last half of a century, have passed away from the Church on earth. The author of this volume has peculiar qualifications for such a work. Having completed a full half century in the Lutheran ministry, having known personally most of the leading men in the Church, taking a prominent part himself in nearly all the important work of the Church, gifted with the use of a ready pen, he was the very man to gather up and preserve, in this permanent form, the rich materials which had been accumulating. No more important or welcome service could have been rendered to the Lutheran Church in this country.

The volume is quite an imposing one, containing six hundred and thirty pages; and yet the author expresses his 'deep regret' at being 'compelled to omit many good things which were properly comprehended within the scope of this book.' Surely the Lutheran Church in this country cannot be barren of materials for a history, when all this is the result of the gleaning of only fifty years. The volume does not profess to be a complete history of our Church in the United States even during this period, but only of what comes within the range of the author's personal observation and knowledge. There is a quite brief HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION, giving a hasty view of the Church from its earliest foundation in this land.

We cannot give a minute account of the varied contents of this volume, but must be satisfied with a somewhat general statement. About two hundred pages, at the beginning, are devoted to sketches and reminiscences of Lutheran ministers. In this part the author has drawn largely upon the labors of Prof. Stœver and Dr. Sprague, as furnished in the *Evangelical Review* and the *Annals of the American Pulpit.* These sketches will be read with great interest, and will be valuable for reference in years to come. Then follow a History of the GENERAL SYNOD, occupying forty-two pages, and also a short History of the GENERAL COUNCIL, prepared by Rev. Dr. Spaeth. OUR CHURCH LITERATURE IN THE UNITED STATES, with a List of Books on Lutheran Church History in America comes next. MARTIN STEPHAN AND THE STEPHANITES then find a place, and then the DEFINITE PLATFORM. The next heading—MODE OF WORSHIP—CULT—

LITURGY, &c.—covers quite a miscellaneous collection of matters and things in the Church. It extends over sixty pages, and contains so great a variety that no attempt will be made to enumerate or specify, except to say that it ranges from the use of Liturgies, etc., to that of gas and wafers. Then follow, Rœdelsheimer's and Streits Legacies; Semi-centennial Jubilee in 1868; (1867?) Lectureships and Prizes; Celebration of Reformation Day; Lutheran Ministers elected or served as Professors; Doctors of Divinity and LL. D. in the Lutheran Church; Members of Foreign Learned Societies; Lutheran Authorship; The Colloquium and the Diet; History of Foreign Missions; Ignorance Concerning our Church; The Maryland Synod Question; English Lutheran Hymn Books; Sunday School Books; Brief Sketches of Lutheran Colleges; Origin and History of Theological Education; Lutheran Almanacs; Theological Seminaries; Anecdotes and Queer Doings of Lutheran Ministers. This last head occupies over eighty pages. We have not presented a very complete view even of leading topics, but enough has been said to show that the volume embraces a wide variety of subjects and must contain a large amount of valuable and interesting information. It is interspersed with humorous remarks, characteristic of the author, and calculated to relieve the tediousness in reading so bulky a work. Dr. Morris deserves well of the Church for this service, and we trust that he will be rewarded by a large sale of the volume, as well as a hearty appreciation of the work done.

We are slow to find any fault, where there is so much room for commendation and where the good accomplished should be chiefly considered. But as honest critics and reviewers we cannot refrain from calling attention, that they may be remedied in future editions, to some very serious defects in this volume. The work as a whole impresses us as having been prepared without the care which might reasonably have been expected—and hence without the systematic arrangement and accuracy which are so important in such a work. It is a rather loose collection of material without much order, or great accuracy. The authors seems to have drawn from his rich and varied collection of materials, without much regard to order or arrangement. We are the more surprised at this, from the established reputation of the author for accurate scholarship, and his well-known severity on some of his weaker brethren who offend in this particular. We can only account for this defect on the ground, that we think the work was prepared under a feeling that authorship is not appreciated in our Church, and that labor and care meet with no suitable reward. Frequent intimations of this were given in the Church papers. It is to be regretted that any such feeling, or any other cause, should have hindered the utmost care in the preparation of a work, which should find a place in every Lutheran family.

We must point out a few things to justify this general criticism. First of all, the volume has no TABLE OF CONTENTS, and we are left to grope our way by the aid of an INDEX, where we usually expect to find such a Table. The INDEX is no guide to the order of subjects treated. Then we begin with "CHAPTER I." but we have looked in vain for any SECOND or THIRD, or any other Chapter. This Chapter I., has a SECOND and THIRD SECTION, without any FIRST. Some of the men in the "YOUNGER class, section II., were older, having been born and having died before some of the older men in the first class. We know that some men are younger at seventy than others at forty. We could name men of thirty-five who look and act as if older than the author of this volume, who gives the ministerial experience of fifty years. Perhaps the classification was made on this principle—else we are at a loss for such cases as Rev. William Beates, born June 14, 1777, died August 17, 1857, being put in an older class than Dr. Hazelius, born 1777, died 1853, or Augustus Wackerhapin, born 1774, and died 1865. In the list of "DOCTORS OF DIVINITY AND LL. D. IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH," we have noticed a very large number of slips and errors in the names of individuals and institutions. Some of these names are so well known, that we imagine the proof could never have been read, or the blunders would have been easily detected; and in regard to all of the men and the institutions, correct information could have been readily obtained. For our humble self, we are very willing not to be counted in—for we do not respond to the call of either J. G. or A. J. Brown—but we are sorry for some others, whose names will hardly be recognized, and for some institutions which have been deprived of honored sons, while others have had them thrust upon them.

There are slips in such well known and public matters at the semi-centennial Jubilee, put in 1868, instead of 1867, which indeed was extended into 1868 ; and of the late civil war, where Dr. Stork is represented as leaving South Carolina in 1861, and the writer "in 1862, owing to the breaking out of the rebel war." "The rebel war" began in 1861, and we seceded early in that year.

We have hesitated to point out such inaccuracies, but we think the author will appreciate our good intentions, and will be glad to make corrections in future editions. We have a little experience in the difficulties of names and date, and in proof reading, and have often been chagrined at blunders which escaped our attention ; and we extend to the author our cordial sympathy in this common frailty of writing and publishing. We hope these criticisms will not lead any to overlook the real merits of the work. It contains a large amount of matter accessible to very few readers, and will afford instruction and pleasure to those who are fortunate enough to possess it. The intimation given by the author, of another volume, will doubtless awaken a very gen-

eral desire, that he may continue his labors in this field, as well as the hope that the reception of the present volume may be such as to encourage him to do so.

J. FREDERICK SMITH, PHILADELPHIA.

First Free Lutheran Diet in America. Philadelphia, December 27-28, 1877. The Essays, Debates and Proceedings. pp. 346. 1878.

The title of this volume indicates its origin and general character. It grew out of the Diet held in St. Matthew's Church, Philadelphia, at the close of the past year, and gives a very satisfactory exhibit of that experiment of holding such meetings. The volume is one of special interest to Lutherans, but cannot fail to command the attention of other denominations, and will have a permanent value. It contains in full, and in some instances more than full, the papers read at the Diet, with the brief discussions which followed the reading of each paper. There is also a report of the Proceedings, including the call for holding the Diet, the names of ministers and laymen who attended, with the opening address by Dr. Morris. For its completeness, the volume owes much to Dr. H. E. Jacobs, who superintended its publication, and prepared a full table of contents aud indexes. These additions by the Editor greatly enhance the value of the volume, making consultation and reference easy and pleasant, and a simple examination of them will show how varied and rich are the materials furnished.

We are tempted to a somewhat extended criticism of this inviting volume, but are restrained by the consideration that our own name appears as one of those who took part in the Diet, and it might not be wise or safe to venture on such a criticism. It will not be deemed egotistic to say that the papers here presented treat of subjects of interest, and that the discussions in these papers are marked by care and scholarly ability. The subjects discussed are: "The Augsburg Confession and the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Anglican Church, by Rev. J. G. Morris, D. D., LL. D.; The Relations of the Lutheran Church to the Denominations around us, by Rev. C. P. Krauth, D. D., LL. D.; The Four General Bodies of the Luthern Church in the United States; Wherein they agree, and wherein they might harmoniously co-operate, by Rev. J. A. Brown, D. D.; The History and Progress of the Lutheran Church in the United States, by Rev. H. E. Jacobs, D. D.; Education in the Lutheran Church in the United States, by Rev. M. Valentine, D. D.; The interests of the Lutheran Church in America as affected by Diversities of Language, by D. Luther, M. D.; Misunderstandings and Misrepresentations of the Lutheran Church, by Rev. J. A. Seiss, D. D.; The Characteristics of the Augsburg Confession, by Rev. F. W. Conrad, D. D.; True and False Spirituality in the Lutheran Church, by Rev. E. Greenwald, D. D.; Liturgical Forms in Worship, by Rev.

C. A. Stork, D. D.; Theses on the Lutheranism of the Fathers of the Church in this Country, by Rev. W. J. Mann, D. D.; The Divine and Human Factors in the Call to the Ministerial Office, according to the Older Lutheran Authorities, by Rev. G. Diehl, D. D.; The Educational and Sacramental Ideas of the Lutheran Church, in relation to Practical Piety, by Rev. A. C. Wedekind, D. D.

Were it not invidious we would mention some of the papers as furnishing material of special and permanent value, but we must be satisfied with a general commendation of the volume. No doubt much difference of opinion will exist as to the merits of the discussion on controverted points, and this must be left to each one's individual judgment. The Diet was a success, accomplished some good, and this volume deserves and will hold a place in the literature of the Lutheran Church. It should have a wide circulation. The publisher has given the volume a neat appearance, as well as a substantial character. To all concerned the work is highly creditable.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., PHILA.

A Study of Milton's Pardise Lost. By John A. Himes, Graeff Professor of the English Language and Literature in Pennsylvania College. pp. 287. 1878.

This is a book for select readers and not for the multitude. It has evidently been prepared with much care, and is the product of prolonged critical study ; and it will doubtless find "fit audience though few." There is a strange contrast between the acknowledged merit of Milton's Paradise Lost and the unstinted praise which has been bestowed upon it, and the popular appreciation and actual amount of reading it receives. We remember to have heard, some years ago, a professional gentleman, of considerable literary reputation, ask the question," who reads Milton's Paradise Lost any more ?" It may not have been very creditable to his taste or judgment, but it indicates the general lack of interest felt in this great English Classic. It may be studied in College as the Iliad and Æneid are, and read by a somewhat wider circle as a matter of duty or pleasure, but it is not a poem to attract superficial or careless readers. Hence, we do not think that Professor Himes has accomplished a task that will be appreciated by the multitude of readers. This book will hardly be popular, or in great demand in ordinary reading circles.

Yet, we believe he has given to the literary world a volume of real value, and one that will be duly appreciated by thoughtful readers, if not by the multitude. THE PARADISE LOST has been deemed worthy of study and criticism by some of the first English critics, from Addison to the present day. This volume is deserving of a place among the most careful ciriticisms of this immortal epic. The writer shows great familiarity with his subject, extensive acquaintance with the

sources whence Milton drew much of his imagery, and has illustrated his criticisms by numerous apt quotations from other great poets, ancient and modern. The style is severely chaste, and, for pleasant reading, would not have suffered if not so measured or precise. There is a lack of free and easy utterance, or of dashing criticisms. Perhaps the the author experienced a little awe of his audience, or was restrained from fear of offending the over fastidious.

The plan of the volume is very simple ; a chapter is devoted to each book of the PARADISE LOST, with two additional chapters ON PECULIARITIES IN THE STYLE AND PLAN, and on THE VERSE. These last two chapters contain very interesting statements and criticisms on the subjects indicated. The lack of a full and complete Index is a serious defect in the volume, and the chief defect we have noticed. Otherwise, it is a volume that admiring students of Milton will welcome.

We do not propose to enter upon any criticism in detail, or to pronounce judgment on the points on which our author differs from distinguished critics who have preceded him. His positions seem to be well sustained. For some years past we have read the PARADISE LOST less than formerly, and are not quite so ready to criticise as then. An old English copy, with Addison's critique, handed down from our grandfather, and abundantly penciled and marked, has been purloined by some unfeeling fellow, and we have not readily taken to any other copy. If this reference shall cause the the restoration of the lost volume, we promise to ask the guilty party no questions, but to return our sincere thanks.

This volume comes out just at a time, when the most elaborate work on the Life and Times of Milton is issuing from the English press. Volume FOURTH and FIFTH of Masson's Life of Milton, have recently appeared in England. The man and his great poem are both receiving the attention of students of English History and Literature. Prof. Himes very appropriately dedicates this volume to JOHN E. GRAEFF, Esq., of Philadelphia, to whose liberality Pennsylvania College is indebted for the establishment of a Chair of English Studies. This early fruit of this endowment will do credit to both the founder and occupant of this Chair. The publishers have presented the work in a very neat and attractive form. Everything about the volume is marked by neatness and finish.

The Last Times; or, Thoughts on Momentous Themes. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., Pastor of the Church of the Holy Communion, Philadelphia, and author of "Miracle in Stone ;" or the Great Pyramid of Egypt. pp. 488. 1878.

This, as we learn from the preface, is the SEVENTH EDITION of this

work. In this age of book making, when only a few of the many books ever reach a second edition, Dr. Seiss may congratulate himself on having achieved a decided success for his volume. It is often referred to and quoted as an authority on the subject of which it treats. The author is well known as an eloquent preacher and very earnest defender of what are called millenarian views. He has devoted special attention to the study of prophecy, and has given his views in other publications, as well as in "THE LAST TIMES." He may justly claim a prominent place among those who advocate the peculiar views of this school. The volume may be commended to those who desire an earnest discussion on this general subject, or who are anxious to know what can be said in support of such a theory of the kingdom of Christ.

Whilst commending the volume as an earnest and sometimes eloquent presentation of the views maintained by the author, on his favorite theme, we are bound to say that we deem it of little value as an interpretation of prophecy, or as shedding any light upon the future of the Church. Indeed we are surprised at the transparent blunders, which the author has allowed to go without correction in this edition of his work—blunders which time has made so manifest that it is enough to mention them. Thus we are informed, on what is alleged to be the authority of "THE GREAT MASS OF THE MOST ACCREDITED INTERPRETERS," that "we are carried down to the year 1866 or 1867, as the time when Christ shall come and the judgment set." In the edition bearing date, 1863, and which is allowed to stand in this edition in italics, we read that we are "within some seven years of the coming of Christ and the beginning of all those solemn wonders." These are only specimens of erroneous conjectures put forth sometimes with as much positiveness as though they were clearly revealed truth. The author acknowledges that his "wider and more matured studies in this department of the Divine Word," has led him to modify somewhat his views as to the interpretation of certain points of Scripture. We think it would have been well, whilst engaged in the task of revision, if he had changed a good many statements, which can serve no purpose except to mislead those who have no means of forming a more correct judgment. We question very much the principle of the statement, when the author, as if to shield himself from the responsibility attached to such utterances, says: "Nor is he any more responsible for what he has written, than are those who dissent, for their adverse opinions." There is such a thing as divine truth, and when one puts forth human errors in its stead, it is strange indeed if there is no more responsibility for teaching the error, than in refusing to receive it. The task would be a tedious one, to go through this volume and point out what we believe to be false interpretations or erroneous applications of Scripture, as well as unauthorized state-

ments of alleged facts. It seems to be one of the peculiarities of this school of interpreters, to be very positive where other men are more cautious. Our commendation of the volume for its earnest spirit and forcible presentation of important truths, must be coupled with a disclaimer of any endorsement of the peculiar millenarian views running throught it, and which we believe to be unscriptural and unfriendly to the growth of genuine piety and true Christian zeal.

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, PHILA.

Life and Death Eternal. A Refutation of the Theory of Annihilation. By Samuel C. Bartlett, D. D., President of Dartmouth College. pp. 390.

This is a re-issue of a work that has been before the public for about a dozen years, and which has endured the test of time to secure a permanent place among publications of its kind. It was originally prepared to meet the spreading heresy of annihilation, and at the solicitation of many friends of the author. He was at the time professor in the Theological Seminary, at Chicago, and enjoyed a reputation for learning and ability, as a careful scholar and thinker, which has been further acknowledged by his election to the Presidency of Dartmouth College, a position which he at present occupies. The work when first issued was favorably received, and its publication by the American Tract Society is evidence that it has the endorsement of leading evangelical denominations. It consists of two parts, each divided into a number of separate Chapters. Part I. embraces: REFUTATION OF THE ARGUMENTS ADVANCED IN SUPPORT OF THE ANNIHILATION OF THE WICKED: Part II. POSITIVE DISPROOF OF THE DOCTRINE OF ANNIHILATION. To these there is added an Appendix, including nine special subjects of interest in this discussion. The work is characterized by moderation of tone, calmness and fairness of discussion, and by logical consistency and conclusiveness. The author shows himself at home in Scripture criticism, and in grappling with this distinctive error. Its calm and deliberate style contrasts with the excited and impassioned manner of most writers on the other side. It has the merit of coolness in discussing a question of deepest personal interest.

The opponents of the Bible doctrine of future punishment are continually changing their positions, and the recent discussions on the general subject of future destiny gives this volume a fresh interest. The present phase of error is not that especially discussed in this volume, and yet the arguments here advanced will serve a more general purpose. Terrible as the doctrine of eternal punishment is, it is best to know the truth. We commend this volume of President Bartlett to all who desire to read a calm and scholarly discussion on this momentous subject.

All For Christ, a Sketch of the Life and Labor of the Rev. Charles H. Payson. Edited by his Brother. pp. 276.

This is a sweet, charming volume, and such a one as only a high style of Christianity can furnish. We look in vain for anything like it under any other system of religion. It is worth more than any volume of evidences to prove that Christianity must be divine.

The subject of this memoir belonged to a family whose name is fragrant in the Churches of this country. Rev. Charles Henry Payson, was born in Leominster, Mass., September 28, 1831, and died in New York, January 25, 1877. His father and grandfather were honored ministers in New England, and his uncle, Dr. Edward Payson is one of the best known names in our American Churches. Charles Henry was a noble son of a noble stock. He graduated at Amherst College, studied theology in Union Seminary, and after some time spent in study in Europe, devoted himself to the self-denying work of a city missionary in New York. Here his great life-work was accomplished. For seventeen years he labored on, chiefly among the lowly and the poor, seeking to lift them up and to impart to them all the blessings of the Gospel. With talents and attainments fitting him for a different sphere of labor, he showed his conscientious adherence to conviction of duty by remaining in a comparatively humble and trying field of labor. But he did a good work, and has left a name that will not die. Although he was a scholar, and loved to gratify his taste by travel and books, visiting the Universities of Europe, and traveling in the East, yet it is as a city missionary that he will be best known. His life and labors in this field help to throw light upon the most perplexing questions of city evangelization. Rev. Dr. Howard Crosby, says: "The Rev. Charles H. Payson was one of the most devoted laborers in this mission field that our city ever saw. With sound judgment, indefatigable industry, quenchless zeal, administrative ability, sympathetic soul and fine pulpit talents, he for seventeen years presided over the Third Avenue Mission of the Madison Square Presbyterian Church, receiving the hearty and liberal aid of that efficient Church. Under his ministry the mission became, in everything but self-support, a strong and useful Church, sending forth its blessed influence in every direction in that important part of the city. He so taught the people to give, that they were able to raise from $4000 to $5000 a year among themselves."

His early death brought sorrow to many hearts, and when he was buried, the tears and lamentations of his congregation, mingled with that of his brethren in the ministry, showed "how they loved him." This volume deserves a wide circulation—and especially as illustrating two lessons, the beauty of true Christian character, and the mission of the Church to the poor.

The Old Bible, and the New Science. An Essay and Four Lectures delivered before the New York Baptist Ministers' Conference. By J. B. Thomas, D. D., Pastor First Baptist Church in Pierrepont Street, Brooklyn. Second Edition. pp. 224.

This volume has already reached a second edition, which is proof of popular appreciation. It deals with questions which have been largely engaging the attention of thoughtful minds of late years—questions fundamental to religion and philosophy. The author shows the weakness of the NEW SCIENCE as a substitute for the revelation contained in the OLD BIBLE. It is one of the very many discussions called forth by the pretensions of a class of modern scientists, and will aid in satisfying readers that the Bible and true religion have little to fear from candid and thorough investigation. It is quite unfair to charge true science with many of the vagaries put forth in her name; and it is well to draw a distinction between the true and the false. True science and the Bible must harmonize. We commend this volume to all who desire to read a defence of divine truth against the assaults of science falsely so called.

Plain Progressive Talks upon the Way of Salvation. By Rev. David R. Breed. pp. 56.

These TALKS are on the topics: Who may be Saved; How to Seek Salvation; How Salvation may be Apprehended; Salvation Assured; The Evidences of Salvation; Full Salvation; How Salvation may be Lost.

LEE & SHEPARD, BOSTON.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

The Intermediate World. By T. L. Townsend, D. D., Professor in Boston University, author of "Credo," etc. pp. 250. 1878.

Dr. Townsend has won for himself an honorable place among living authors. He writes with great clearness and force, under the direction of fine scholarship and wide knowledge. This volume has been published in view of the present awakened interest in questions of the future life. It is thus a book for the times, though the subject is not new.

The range of discussion is indicated in the topics of the different chapters: "The Place; A World of Consciousness; A Dual World; A World of Fixedness; Not a World of Judicial Rewards nor Punishments; The Transit. These chapters are followed by forty pages of valuable Notes. The subject is viewed from the standpoint of evangelical Christianity, and the Scripture evidence is given that 'the Intermediate State' cannot be looked upon as a continued probation for neglecters of salvation in this life. Though the book bears evidence of the rapid writing in which the author has produced it, it is

a worthy and valuable contribution to the present discussions, marked by freshness and vigor, and presenting the important subject under its latest phases. It is a book for the people.

The Fall of Damascus. An Historical Novel. By Charles Wells Russell. pp. 287. 1878.

The capture of Damascus by the Arabians, during the reign of the Roman Emperor Heraclius, forms the historical point with which the persons and incidents of this story are connected. The characters introduced are Greek, Roman, Syrian and Saracen, and are drawn with great distinctness and vigor. The scenes, varied, strange, often weird with elements of the supernatural, are colored in much of the rich luxuriance of the Oriental imagination. The development of the plot, managed with skill, takes strong hold of the reader's interest to the end. We feel, however, that the influence of the book on young readers must be unhealthy and injurious. stimulating them to impure imagination by the scenes of brilliant vice through which some of the sensuous pictures take them. That punishment is made to overtake sin in the end, is not enough to cleanse off the evil thus thrown into young hearts.

Bluffton: A Story of To-day. By M. J. Savage.

This volume, by the author of "Christianity the Science of Manhood," has been prepared in the interest of Unitarianism and free religionism. It presents a story of a young clergyman, educated in orthodox schools, settling in a western town, passing through the doubts and struggles of a disturbed faith, and at last emerging into the liberty of light in which orthodox Christianity is given up. The author has written with ability and made a volume with enough of life, love and adventure to excite the constant interest of the reader. But a book of this kind, however it may serve as a means of propagandism for skeptical views, amounts to nothing as evidence against the orthodox faith of the Church. In fiction, a writer can mould his characters to suit his purpose; and there is something essentially unfair and dishonest when he pictures every orthodox believer introduced as hard, stupid, mean, hypocritical, rotten at heart, a scamp or villain, and every skeptic or doubter as somebody noble, ingenuous, trustworthy, the very pink of moral goodness. Such misrepresentation is not a good fruit of the author's faith.

The Voyages and Adventures of Vasco Da Gama. By George M. Towle. Illustrated. pp. 294. 1878.

The volume is the first of the "Young Folks' Series," in which the author means to present the "Heroes of History" in as interesting a way as possible, "the true and exciting stories of some famous voy-

agers and discoverers whose names are not unfamiliar to young people, but whose deeds and adventures are less known." The object is to relate truthfully some of the wonderful things that have happened in the world, "the great discoveries made by dint of dauntless courage, unfaltering perseverance, contempt of obstacles, and sturdy conquest of perils by land and sea, the search for fabled treasures and hazardous travels among strange and interesting people."

The author has done his work well in this first volume, giving to the young a book that will attract and hold their interest and enlarge their historical and geographical information.

Rothmel. By the Author of "That Husband of Mine."

"Rothmel" is a novel of a somewhat sensational kind. The interest kindled by the story grows out of the mysteries and complications, which resulted from a clandestine marriage of a romantically inclined young lady. It will probably prove popular among novel readers who crave high-wrought representations and strange developments. The writer, who has attained an extensive popularity, by "That Husband of Mine," possesses strength and skill. But the pictures are intensified into an unnaturalness that, frequently repeated, becomes disagreeable. One wearies of perpetually recurring delineations of fingers made "cold," "lips colorless white," and all manner of passionate manifestations on every little occasion. The moral aim of the book is evidently to impress the lesson that wrong doing brings on its sad and often torturing retributions; but we believe that the morbid sentiment that is fostered by the unwise and sometimes guilty love adventures of such novels is not likely to guard the virtue of readers.

A Year Worth Living: A Story of a Place and of a People one cannot afford not to know. By William M. Baker, author of "Inside," "The New Timothy," "Mose Evans," "Carter Quarterman," etc. pp. 328. 1878.

Mr. Baker has become a favorite story-writer. This volume will not detract from his reputation. It is written in a very pleasant, pure, natural style. It takes us through the scenery and society of the sunny South. The characters are well drawn and full of life. In the hero of the story, the author portrays the incidents in the life of a young minister, who had been called from the Seminary to take charge of the leading church in a southern city. It records his trials and pleasures, in the various experiences that stir through his history. The attention of the reader is stimulated at every step, and held strongly to the last. Some of the pictures have great humor in them. The moral tone and teaching are good, and the book is worthy of the popularity which it will doubtless attain.

HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

History of the English People. By John Richard Green, M. A. Vol. II. The Monarchy, 1461—1540; The Reformation, 1540—1603. pp. 500. 1878.

The simple announcement of this SECOND VOLUME might suffice for a work, that has become so well known as GREEN'S HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE; but it deserves something more than a simple announcement. This volume covers a period of profoundest interest in the history of the Church, as well as of civil government, and which will be studied through all time. Commencing with the dawn of the Reformation, it carries us forward, through a century and a half, to the full establishment of Protestantism in England. It requires but a hasty glance at these two volumes to show how the story grows in interest and importance as it proceeds. The first volume covers a period of a thousand years, from the dawn of English History to the middle of the fifteenth century; this one only a hundred and fifty years, and even then the narrative seems to flow more rapidly than at the beginning.

These were indeed stirring times in the history of the Church and the world. Great principles were striving for the mastery. The battles of civil and religious liberty were being fought. Characters, which will be famous through all ages to come, appear upon the stage and perform their part. Henry the Eighth, Wolsey, Cromwell, Mary Stuart, and Queen Elizabeth, are among the most prominent of these, and are exhibited in a most life-like manner. It is no dull or dry narrative of facts that we are invited to examine, but a living panorama moving before us. We can see the figures and hear them speak.

Readers of different tastes will here find material to gratify them. Religion, with its noble army of heroes and martyrs, freedom, with its struggles and victories, literature, with its grandest treasures, greet the reader of this volume. Many of the pictures are drawn with dramatic skill and power. The death-scene of Queen Elizabeth, with which this volume closes, is one that will hardly be forgotten by any reader. Elizabeth's character has been portrayed in a preceding part of the volume, but now comes the close:

"But if ministers and courtiers were counting on her death, Elizabeth had no mind to die. She had enjoyed life as the men of her day enjoyed it, and now that they were gone she clung to it with a fierce tenacity. She hunted, she coquetted and scolded and frolicked at sixty-seven as she had done at thirty. 'The Queen,' wrote a courtier a few months before her death, 'was never so gallant these many years nor so set upon jollity.' She persisted, in spite of opposition, in her gorgeous progresses from country-house to country-house. She clung to business as of old, and rated in her usual fashion 'one who minded not to giving up some matter of account.' But death crept on. Her

face became haggard, and her frame shrank almost to a skeleton. At last her taste for finery disappeared, and she refused to change her dresses for a week together. A strange melancholy settled down on her. 'She held in her hand,' says one who saw her in her last days, 'a golden cup, which she often put to her lips: but in truth her heart seemed too full to need more filling.' Gradually her mind gave way. She lost her memory, the violence of her temper became unbearable, her very courage seemed to forsake her. She called for a sword to lie constantly beside her and thrust it from time to time through the arras, as if she heard murderers stirring there. Food and rest became alike distasteful. She sate day and night propped up with pillows on a stool, her finger on her lip, her eyes fixed on the floor, without a word. If she once broke the silence, it was with a flash of her old queenliness. When Robert Cecil declared that she 'must' go to bed the word roused her like a trumpet. 'Must!' she exclaimed; 'is MUST a word to be addressed to princes? Little man, little man! thy father, if he had been alive, durst not have used that word.' Then, as her anger spent itself, she sank into her old dejection. 'Thou art so presumptuous,' she said, 'because thou knowest I shall die.' She rallied once more when the ministers beside her bed named Lord Beauchamp, the heir to the Suffolk claim, as a possible successor. 'I will have no rogue's son,' she cried hoarsely, 'in my seat.' But she gave no sign, save a motion of the head, at the mention of the King of Scots. She was in fact fast becoming insensible; and early the next morning, on the twenty-fourth of March, 1603, the life of Elizabeth, a life so great, so strange and lonely in its greatness, ebbed quietly away.

The Elements of Rhetoric. By James De Mille, M. A. pp. 564. 1878.

The Principles of Rhetoric and their Application. By Adam S. Hill, Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory in Harvard College. With an Appendix, comprising General Rules for Punctuation. pp. 302. 1878.

These two volumes, although differing widely as to their scope and design, may be conveniently noticed together. They treat of the same general subject, and must to some extent traverse the same field, yet in such a way as to be entirely dissimilar in the manner of treatment and in the materials presented. To begin with, the one of them contains twice as much matter as the other, and includes a mnch wider range of discussion. Professor Hill's volume is more elementary. and presents the general laws of Rhetoric. It deals with the principles of the art. Mr. De Mille's enters more largely into the department of criticism, and furnishes a very wide range of illustrations of the various kinds of composition. Some account of each volume will give a better idea of their contents, and we take first that of

Professor Hill. He claims that Rhetoric is not a science, but an ART, and defines it as "the art of efficient communication by language." The work is divided into two parts. Part I. discusses and illustrates the general principles which apply to written or spoken discourses of every kind. Part II. deals with those principles which apply, exclusively or especially, to Narrative or to Argumentative Composition. In Part I. we have some fifty pages of interesting and valuable matter on Grammatical Purity, and double that amount on the Choice and Use of Words. With nothing very original or new, this part of the volume is judicious and furnishes valuable aid towards the attainment of purity and propriety in the use of language. It may be commended to the careful attention of all who desire to use our language for its legitimate ends. The second Part, devoted to the different kinds of composition, handles Movement and Method in narration, and the different kinds of argumentation. The Appendix contains rules for punctuation. and the use of capital letters. The volume is well adapted to be used as a text-book or for private study, and if carefully studied, and its rules followed, would greatly aid many who need improvement in writing good English. Professor Hill's volume is not at all ambitious in its pretentions, but aims to be, and may be made, eminently useful.

The work of Mr. De Mille is more pretentious. It is divided into six parts, three of which are devoted to STYLE: Part I. Perspicuity in style; Part II. Persuasiveness in style; and Part III. Harmony in style; whilst Part IV. treats of Method; Part V. of the Emotions; and Part VI. of The General Departments of Literature. We know of no volume of its size, on this subject, that is so abundant in examples and illustrations. This is, indeed, stated in the Preface as "a leading feature of the book," and it will be found strictly true. Some idea of the fulness and variety of this volume may be gained from the Index, which fills twenty pages of fine print, and is very complete. It is a valuable addition to our works on Rhetoric. Both of these can be safely commended, each having peculiar excellences of its kind.

Life after Death; or Post Mortem Accountability. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., Phila. G. W. Frederick. pp. 39. 1878.

This Sermon is marked by the vigorous style and earnest manner of the author. It deals with an old, yet at present, exciting theme, and is worthy of a wide circulation and reading.

CONTENTS OF NO. III.

—o—

Article. Page.

I. The Apparition at Endor,..... 321

By L. A. Gotwald, D. D., York, Penna.

II. The Ethiopic Book of Baruch,..... 333

By Rev. George H. Schodde, A. M., Ph. D., Alleghany, Pa.

III. The True Position of the Lutheran Church in Relation to the Authority of Human Creeds, before the Publication of the Form of Concord, in 1580,..... 352

By R. Weiser, D. D., of Georgetown, Colorado.

IV. History of the Hebrew Translation of the New Testament,..... 363

By Rev. B. Pick, Ph. D., Rochester, N. Y.

V. Objections to the Cause of Ministerial Education Considered,..... 369

By L. M. Heilman, A. M., Harrisburg, Pa.

VI. Course and Character of Emigration, and What Per Cent. is Available to the Lutheran Church,..... 382

By Rev. Prof. Samuel Aughey, Ph. D., Lincoln, Nebraska.

VII. Of the Use of the Sacraments,..... 396

By W. M. Baum, D. D., Philadelphia.

VIII. Literary Intelligence,..... 456

American.—Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Historical and Biographical—Miscellaneous.

German.—Biblical—Systematic—Apologetics—Historical.

IX. Notices of New Publications,..... 459

Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry—First Free Lutheran Diet in America—A Study of Milton's Paradise Lost—The Last Times, or Thoughts on Momentous Themes—Life and Death Eternal—All for Christ—The Old Bible, and the New Science—Plain Progressive Talks upon the Way of Salvation—The Intermediate World—The Fall of Damascus—Bluffton—The Voyages and Adventures of Vasco Da Gama—Rothmel—A Year Worth Living—History of the English People—The Elements of Rhetoric—The Principles of Rhetoric and their Application—Life After Death.

PERIODICALS.

The exciting questions in Europe and the East have given a special interest to the Foreign Quarterlies and Blackwood. Opposing views have been presented with vigor and the earnestness inspired by partisan feeling. England has been deeply stirred and sentiment divided. The counsels of peace have triumphed, and diplomacy will settle what fighting could not. The Living Age, and Harper's Magazine, have fully sustained their well-earned reputation for variety and richness of material. The various Reviews and Magazines are enlisting the ablest writers of the day, including distinguished statesmen and public men, as well as more quiet and studious scholars. Periodical literature has reached an immense circulation, and furnishes some of the best and some of the poorest productions of brain and pen.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF THE

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

OCTOBER, 1878.

ARTICLE I.

HOW SHALL WE TRAIN THE MINISTRY FOR THE TIMES?

By Rev. James W. Richard, Professor in Carthage College, Carthage, Ills.

In giving answers to the above question, I shall not be guided by any standard of ministerial training now obtaining either in our own or in any other Church; neither shall I advocate any chimerical or utopian scheme, but I shall urge such a scheme of training as is clearly within the limits of possibility, such a scheme as the Church can readily furnish, and as the average mind can easily compass. I shall advocate such a system of training as will give the ministry true commanding power in the realm of mind and thought, and as will secure to the Church the one indispensable mean of meeting the vast demands which the age now imposes upon her. For two things are generally conceded by intelligent Christians, first, that the Church never had a more important work before her than she has at present, and, secondly, that her ministry is not fully adequate to lead in this important work—that they are in need of a special training for which full provision has not yet been made. It is the purpose of this

article to mark out a line of ministerial training, which is to run deeper and to extend farther than anything of the kind which has yet been followed.

I. WE MUST GIVE A MORE THOROUGH TRAINING IN THE NATURAL SCIENCES.

This of course presupposes the ordinary training in mathematics, languages, history and literature, furnished by the best Colleges and Universities, as preliminary and necessary to the facile and successful comprehension of scientific terms, theories, and facts. For experience has clearly shown that those students always, *ceteris paribus*, succeed best in the study of the natural sciences, who have a broad and liberal literary culture, as providing the only true basis for accurate and useful scholarship.

The importance of having the ministry more thoroughly trained in the fundamental principles of the natural sciences, arises from the fact, that the greatest opposition to religion, both natural and revealed, comes from the scientific investigators of the age, who, dazzled by their brilliant discoveries in the physical world, have their eyes closed to the invisible things of creation, even the eternal power and Godhead, and who are therefore trying to undermine or destroy the foundations of our confidence in the God of Nature and of Revelation. These investigators have, unquestionably, accumulated vast masses of scientific facts, and have made certain grand and most startling generalizations in regard to the universality of law, and the correlation and conservation of the physical forces. Then, applying the rules, the balance, and the scalpel to the study of mind and spirit, because the subtle substance cannot be measured, or weighed, or dissected, they boldly assert that mind and spirit nowhere exist as separate entities, or as independent, self-existent forces.

Here begins the conflict. Christianity recognizes God as the supreme, absolute Spirit, and the human soul as an imperishable substance, distinct from and controlling matter. Materialism knows only matter and laws. Hence the sneers of the scientists at revelation, their challenges, their attitude

of war, their determination to sweep the Bible and the religion of Christ from the earth, and to substitute for them the deification of law and the worship of the Grand Etre, who is defined by M. Comte as the "continuous resultant of all the forces capable of voluntarily concurring in the universal perfectioning of the world, not forgetting our worthy auxiliaries, the animals."

Now the Church must either leave these atheists and materialists in undisputed possession of the field, or she must train her teachers to meet them. But they must not be met by rant, assertion and dogmatism, but by calm and deliberate argument, by clear and intelligent apprehension of the subject in dispute, and with keen analysis of the sophistries of the enemy; that is, every minister of the Gospel should have some acquaintance with the entire field of the natural sciences, that he may understand both the strength and the weakness of the foe, and know where and when to strike, and where and when to let alone. Even the average practical pastor should know enough about the errors and pretensions of modern materialistic skepticism, and the principles and facts of true science, to be able to resolve the doubts and answer the objections of honest inquirers after the truth, instead of turning them away with that cold indifference, which often transforms doubt into unbelief, and unbelief into open rupture with faith.

As a hundred years ago Christianity was mainly attacked by Deism, and a little later by Rationalism, so to-day it is ominously threatened by the materialism of false science, which resolves all mind into matter, and all thought and feeling and faith into chemical and molecular action of matter.* Originating in Germany, this philosophy first passed into England, where it poisoned and corrupted many of the best

---

* Prof. Huxley denies that he is a materialist, but confesses to the use of a "materialistic terminology," and adopts a "physical basis" of life and mind. Prof. Bain believes in only "one substance, with two sets of properties, two sides,—the physical side and the mental side, a double-faced unity. Moleschot says, "thought is a motion of matter." For refutation, see Cook's Lectures on Biology.

minds in church and state and school. Thence it came across the Atlantic into America, and is now being promulgated from Maine to California, in lay sermons and popular lectures, in novels and newspaper articles, in songs and poems, until it forms a very large part of the intellectual pabulum of a very large part of our population. In the words of Dr. Park, "Objections coming from men of science are now diffused among the people. Treatises written for German philosophers are now translated for American mechanics. The thoughts of German Pantheists are distilled into American essays and poems. The reverence of men for the truth is imperiled by the skeptical inquiries into even the human virtues of our Redeemer. The assaults upon the truth will probably become more and more frequent and ingenious. Foreigners have come to our shores at the rate of a thousand a day, and will come at a more fearful rate. An unprecedented number of them will be trained scholars. Many of them will be Neologists, Pantheists, Atheists. In this home of free thought and free speech they will have an influence. This influence must not be resisted by men who declaim against, but by men who reason against, Neology, Pantheism, Atheism. Our young clergymen must be trained not to make a noise about these errors,—'a bishop must be apt to teach, no striker, no brawler,'—but to understand these errors and to meet them as *Greek* meets *Greek*."

Although written ten years ago, much of this language has been translated into actual fact. Within the last six years we have had Tyndall, Büchner, Huxley, and others, teaching atheism to American audiences and striving to inspire contempt for all religion. We have had the Prayer Test, the Delmonico utterances, the Belfast Speech, the Johns Hopkins' Inaugural. We have with us Prof. Youmans and Prof. Draper, the American disciples of these foreign atheists, and a more than half atheistic secular press popularizing godless science and scattering its poison over the land. We have the *Atlantic Monthly*, the *Popular Science Monthly*, *et id omne genus*, distilling German Neology and Pantheism, and English Atheism and Materialism, into almost all of our pe-

riodical literature. We have school directors and superintendents of public instruction, who are expelling the Bible from the public schools and opening a regular crusade* against all school books which contain the name of *God*, or of *Christ*, or of the *Holy Ghost*. We have professors in our Colleges and Universities, who are teaching our young men and women to ignore the God who made them and the Christ who redeemed them.† Now we would lay no embargo or restraint on scientific investigation, nor on the teaching of science, (for that is what we are pleading for), nor would we utter a word in opposition to the great heroes of science, either living or dead, nay, we hail them with applause and bid them a hearty God-speed, for whoever investigates the realms of nature and discovers her laws, is the friend and benefactor of man. But we do most decidedly object to leaving a monopoly of science in the hands of those who use it for the destruction of the other institutions of God. We do object to having these men use the works of God to overthrow His word. We do object to letting this vast army of enemies to the Church go on in the business of robbing the people of their faith in God, and of sowing the seeds of irreligion in the minds of our youth. We do object to having history repeat itself in another Reign of Terror, because we have avowed infidelity in America as the people did in France a century ago.

---

* It is but a short time since this was done in Chicago.

† The writer has been assured by the most competent witnesses, that many of our western universities and state schools are "regular hotbeds" of atheism and materialism—so much so that even some students have recoiled from them and expressed disgust at the tendency. In one case a learned professor, a Lutheran clergyman, was called to account by a colleague for emphasizing the "blood" of Christ in reading the Scriptures, and has been attacked by the secular press for "teaching science from a religious standpoint." Ought not these facts to open the eyes of the Church and of Christian parents, and start the inquiry, whether it is safe to leave the education of the youth in the hands of the state, where they are left without instruction in the duties they owe to God and their own souls? Does not a PRACTICAL equipment for life include some knowledge of God and the human soul?

But how shall the danger be met? Certainly not by pious cant and declamation. We can meet it effectually only through the Church, by having the ministry enter into the enemy's camp and, seizing his arms and treasures, turn them against him. In order to do this, the Church must have the very best training schools, which she must keep in active operation at all times for the express purpose of qualifying men for this service. As evidently, for much time to come, the Church will have to contend with the encroachments of false science, the duty now devolves upon her to prepare to defend herself, not principally with the dogmas of revelation, which would be of little service in this contest, but mainly with arguments and facts drawn from a sound philosophy and a true science. That is, the Church should not only train her ministers in theology, but she should give them the additional advantage of the power and influence to be derived from scientific truth, since all truth is self-consistent and has it source in God, and can be used for God's glory. Too long has it been said, and with too much justice, that the ministry has been indifferent and even hostile to the study of the natural sciences. It is time they were throwing off this reproach and entering into this goodly land themselves, not that they may flourish from the pulpit the language and deal in the technicalities of the schools; not that they may preach physics, or chemistry, or geology, or botany; but that they may at least turn the legitimate and proper conclusions from these sciences to the defence and illustration of the truth of Revelation, that like Christ and his apostles, in many of their most beautiful and sublime discourses, they may make an intelligent use of the things which men see around them for imparting and impressing spiritual instruction. Neither would we have the minister of the gospel charge his mind with the minutiæ of science, nor spend in original and extended research the time that should be given to the practical duties of the pulpit, or of the parish, but we would have him understand the fundamental principles and acquainted with scientific methods, that he may be able to distinguish the true from the false.

Thirty years ago Hugh Miller said: "The battle of the Evidences will have as certainly to be fought on the field of the physical sciences, as it was contested in the last age on that of the metaphysics. And on this new arena the combatants will have to employ new weapons, which it will be the privilege of the challenger to choose."* It is needless to say that this prophecy has been fulfilled. We are now in the heat of the battle. The conflict is going on all round us. It is becoming sharper and sharper, and will be longer or shorter in proportion to the celerity shown by the challenged party in learning to use the enemy's weapons and in acquiring his mode of warfare. The old weapons of the eighteenth century will not answer in this new conflict, any more than the old flint-lock muskets and blunderbusses of our revolutionary fathers, would answer against modern needle-guns and Sharp's rifles. If we would insure victory in the battle of the Evidences, we must be armed as the enemy is armed. Our leaders must study in the same schools and be trained on the same ground as the enemy. And on the day of conflict they must have in their hands the same weapons which the enemy brings against them—that is, the same scientific facts and a knowledge of the same great laws of nature. Having this equality of training and of implements, together with the advantage of being able to plant her feet upon the everlasting Rock, the Church will soon gain the victory and win a large spoil of truth. In some part, this has already been done. Astronomy has shown that the heavens do declare the glory of God, and geology, that of old He laid the foundations of the earth, and chemistry, that the very elements of matter have been weighed and measured and adjusted with infinite precision†.

The charge has often been made against the Bible by the infidel and atheistic science of the day, that it is an antiqua-

---

* See "Foot-prints of the Creator."

* See Art. IX. in "Scribner's Monthly," April, 1878; also Dr. Tayler Lewis' Special Introduction to the First Chapter of Genesis in Lange's Commentary; also Essay of Prof. Guyot of Princeton, printed in the Proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance, 1873; also,

ted book, which is far behind the age, and that it must be either corrected or supplemented by the discoveries of modern science. This charge could be made by those only who are ignorant of the spirit, the aim, and the material contents of the Bible, and who, like Hume, have never attentively read it, and yet presume to sit in judgment upon it. The Bible is not indeed a book on natural sciences, and yet it contains the germs and elements of all true science. In Geology, Moses is older than either Hutton or Werner; in Astronomy, Job and Isaiah far antedate Copernicus, Galileo and Newton; and in Natural History, we have Solomon speaking of plants and beasts and creeping things when the land of Linnæus was yet a swamp of the German Ocean, and the birth-place of Cuvier was a howling wilderness. And it could be easily shown that the Bible is the forerunner of all true modern science, and that its authors are the teachers of all subsequent ages, and that their deliverances will harmonize with all the facts and actual discoveries of science; and what is of scarcely less importance, that the great pioneers and promoters of almost every branch of modern science, have been guided by the star of faith.*

Now it is the duty of the Church—a duty she owes to her Founder, herself and to the world—to have her religious teachers come to the preaching of the Gospel with the clear and strong conviction as the result of the actual study of both the word and the works of God, that there is no conflict between the utterances of His lips and the creation of His hands. It is the duty of the Church to require that her teachers know not only the doctrines of the Bible, but also the objections raised against them. It is her duty to make

---

God Revealed in Nature and in Christ, Book One, by James B. Walker. These are all very valuable monographs, that should be studied by every one interested in the relation of cosmical and other physical subjects to the Bible.

* "It is delightful," says Mallet, "to see how such heroes of science as Copernicus and Kepler, as Baco de Verulam, Newton, Haller, Buckland, etc., bow in lowest reverence before Revelation, whilst the light troops file by without so much as removing their hats."

them all able to distinguish between the facts and principles of true science and the conjectures and assumptions of false science, whence come the "oppositions" to revealed religion. For, unquestionably, one of the prime wants of the Church to-day, is a larger number of men of intellect and thorough training, who will throw themselves into the broad deep gulf which yawns between faith and modern culture, and who, by their learning and science, will help to fill up the mighty chasm, and to construct upon it a royal highway for the more speedy coming of the King. The Church wants more men, who will see in every opening flower, in the revolving seasons, in the rolling planet, in life in death, in every natural phenomenon, something more than a mere succession of orderly changes, or the operation of blind unintelligent forces. She wants men who will see behind all these mighty moving masses of matter, behind all laws and changes, the wise intellect, the strong hand and the benevolent will, of the great Creator, who clothes the lilies with beauty, takes care of the sparrow, and makes the sun to shine by day and the moon and the stars to give light by night. She also wants men, who are more fully abreast with the current of infidel and materialistic thought, and who are therefore prepared to assist in a profounder comprehension and a more scientific vindication of Christianity. To raise up and qualify such a ministry, is clearly within her power, and, therefore, it becomes her duty, to address herself to the task.*

---

* There is a deep conviction among the more intelligent and wide-awake junior clergy, that in our theological seminaries too much time is given to the dissection of old and long exploded heresies and errors, and by far too little to the consideration of the living questions of the day. An examination of catalogues from leading theological seminaries makes the impression that there is reason for this conviction. From many I select three: Princeton has seven professors and one assistant; Andover, seven professors, one assistant, and three lecturers; but neither of them has either a professorship or a lectureship on the relations of science to theology. Gettysburg has three professors and one lecturer on the "Relations of Science and Revelation, who, as we happen to know, delivers a VERY FEW lectures each year. Other cat-

II. WE MUST PROVIDE AMPLER TRAINING IN MENTAL PHILOSOPHY.

Necessitated by the very constitution of our nature to philosophize, and surrounded by circumstances which compel us to inquire into the causes and relations of things, it is of the highest importance that he who assumes to be the spiritual guide of others, should himself understand something of the phenomena of spirit, and of the laws which regulate and govern his own spiritual faculties and those of others. Psychological studies, therefore, are of great practical use to the minister of the Gospel as giving him command of his own mind and of the mind of others. But they have also a far higher value in the prolegomena of theological studies, as furnishing the gateway to proper theistic conceptions, and as leading to a correct anthropology. Our ideas of God as an intelligent, moral and spiritual Being, are, in large part, derived from the ideas and conceptions we have of the faculties and operations of our own spirits. We are conscious of possessing intelligence, a moral sense, a rational soul, a free will. These are discovered to be different from matter, and not to be governed by its laws. Then comes the question, Whence these attributes? They must have a cause. That cause

---

alogues make, in general, a less favorable showing as to the extent and comprehensiveness of the curriculum. From correspondence and personal observation, we learn that many of the questions of the day are incidentally discussed in various connections throughout the course, but that they receive no special, systematic, thorough and comprehensive treatment—that they are brought in rather as side issues, and, consequently, an impression is made upon the minds of students that these questions are of secondary importance. In this respect we are behind the Free Church of Scotland, which, in the Edinburgh College, (theological), has a professorship of "Natural Science," and requires students to attend one recitation in that department every day throughout the entire Junior year. The Glasgow College has a lectureship of Natural Science of the same extent and requirements as the professorship at Edinburgh.

We respectfully call the attention of those having the charge of theological education, to this manifold deficiency, and ask them to consider the importance of immediately providing ampler facilities for the study of the connection between the Physical Sciences and Revelation.

must itself have these qualities, *i. e.*, must be intelligent, free, and have moral discernment. Then, by combining these conceptions with our ideas of infinite time and space, we reach the conclusion that God is a Being infinite in all His attributes. This is the starting point—the *terminus a quo*—of Theology, of the λόγος περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ. But he who has never studied the operations of his own mind, and knows little or nothing of the laws of the human spirit and of the method by which the reason advances from premises to conclusions, must always remain deficient or in error in his conceptions of the Divine Spirit. He may be assured in his own mind of the existence of the Divine Spirit, he may feel and know that there is a God, but he will fail in presenting the strong and clear argument for the conviction of others.

Now the question of the existence and attributes of the Divine Being, which we have said is the initial point of theology, evidently involves some of the nicest shades of Psychological distinction. For we find that the definitions which philosophers have given of God, and the notions they have entertained in regard to his attributes, are the exact counterparts of their systems of Psychology. For instance, Kant, imposing certain *a priori* forms and conceptions on mind, reached the conclusion, logically, no doubt, from his premises, that there is no God whose existence can be proved by pure reason. Hamilton, following Kant too closely, and starting with the notion that all knowledge is relative, ends by making God the unconditioned and absolute, whose "existence we are only warranted in assuming as a certain kind of cause necessary to account for a certain state of things." Herbert Spencer, taking up Hamilton's principles, but not restrained by the practical faith of either Kant or Hamilton, has swept God from the region of the knowable, and, for all the practical purposes of faith, has completely annihilated the object of religious reverence and affection, for man can never fear and love that which cannot be known. This brief historical sketch shows the intimate connection between Philosophy and the foundations of Theology, also the evil effects resulting to Theology of reasoning from false data of Phi-

losophy. Had Kant given a Philosophy based upon induction and the testimony of consciousness and the senses, Herbert Spencer had, in all probability, stopped far short of Nihilism.

Now, since men will philosophize and must philosophize, and since all systems of theology and morals are based upon and are more or less shaped by systems of philosophy, the student of theology and the preacher of the Gospel should be well trained in, at least, the fundamental principles of the philosophy of facts and of common sense, and should be made familiar with the history of opinions, that he may be able to distinguish the true from the false, the practical from the transcendental, and that he may know how to address the intellect, to stir the emotions, and to influence the will. And this, not that the preacher should speculate about the revealed doctrines of salvation, or etherealize and mystify the solid and simple truths of the Gospel, but that he may oppose a false philosophy by a true one, and may have an assured basis for the original and independent study of theology, and may not be traced hither and thither by the latest book and the newest system, but that he may have a system of his own, and a reason in the nature of things for the hope he entertains and for the doctrines he promulgates. And as the preacher has much to do with the ethics of theology, that is, the practical duties of religion, the right and wrong in human conduct, he will find that philosophy is none the less important and fundamental on that account. For the notion which a man has of the moral faculty, and of the law by which it is governed, and of the will as bound or free, will always shape his views of responsbility, and of the merit and demerit of human actions in any given case; and, rising higher, they will also affect his view of the Divine Character in its relations to the human subject, and will finally extend to the question of rewards and punishments in the world to come. Hence a correct Psychology is as necessary for a correct, consistent and homogeneous system of morals, as it is for a correct and consistent system of Theology; for in either case we must go back to first principles.

Now, while it is true that only a few men are born with

metaphysical minds, yet all may and can acquire a knowledge of the fundamental facts and principles of Philosophy, as of language, mathematics, and the sciences, and may use them as guide-boards and land-marks in the field of thought for himself, and as weapons against errors of the head and false beliefs of the heart in others. By these means also the preacher will address men through those laws of the mind which must always be obeyed, if we would secure success, for in so far forth as a man speaks in accordance with the laws of his own trained mind, will his words find a ready response from the mind of others, "and God will honor those laws and men will feel that he does not speak as a man, but as a man sent from God, for he will not say, this is what I am inclined to think; this is what a synod of men has sanctioned, but this is reasonable, and what is reasonable, is kingly, and he who despises what is proved, despises not man but God. He that believeth shall have peace, but he that believeth not shall be at war with himself."

Philosophy has sometimes been abused in the pulpit, therefore some have opposed its pursuit altogether by students of Theology. But here, as in all other learning,

> "Shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
> And drinking deeply sobers us again."

It is the small philosophy, the mere smattering that bewilders and leads men astray, and loses them in the mists and fogs of speculation. It is depth in philosophy that delivers men from darkness and shows them the light and clothes them with power. In metaphysical acumen and profundity of thought, President Edwards stood nearly on a level with the mighty Stagirite himself; while the mind of Dr. Chalmers embraced the entire circle of the sciences and was profoundly philosophical, yet they were among the most simple, and altogether the most powerful preachers of their respective times. In great learning, rare mental endowments and wonderful philosophic depth, they joined humble and devout piety and a yearning for souls. Whilst a rich vein of philosophy runs through their sermons, yet it is everywhere

measured by the golden reed of God's sanctuary and made the hand-maiden of Theology. It was simply the instrument by which they pierced men's minds to let in the light and the truth from above. They used it not to make a display or to get a name, but to open a way for the Gospel, holding this latter as the divine Philosophy, which alone can quicken the conscience and sanctify the heart.

What we have said thus far in answer to the question at the head of this article, is, in the main, contemplated and *attempted* by the course of study laid down in the catalogues of our colleges. This course does indeed embrace a wide range of subjects, but the time allowed for their proper pursuit is altogether too short to furnish the training for which we plead and which the age demands. As about nine-tenths of our colleges have been established by the Church, to supply her wants in the matter of the ministry, and as she can hope to reap only what she sows, so should her representatives arrange the course of study with sole reference to her wants, with the view of providing the broadest and most liberal culture. When our American college curriculum was established, one to two centuries ago, many of the sciences now looming into prominence and claiming a place in every system of liberal training, were almost, or altogether, unknown. Then, four years with Latin, Greek, Mathematics and a little science, were enough to train men for the service of the Church. But now the curriculum of our colleges has become very large and is receiving additions almost every year, but the qualifications for admission remain about the same as at the beginning, and only four years are given to complete the course. The result is, that we have a low standard of scholarship, and the degrees of A. B. and A. M., which once indicated at least respectable attainment in literature, science and philosophy, now give no assurance of anything beyond the most meagre superficiality. According to our present methods of education, something is gained in breadth, but much is lost in depth. A consequence is, that running with so much haste and rapidity over so wide a field, we fail rightly to develop and strengthen the higher facul-

ties of the mind. We cultivate the memory, but we do not properly stimulate thought. Hence it can no longer be questioned that our American colleges, with all their appliances and numerous professors, tend to prodnce *accomplishments*, rather than thoughtful, contemplative and accurate scholarships. Students, in many instances, do not have time to form a taste or a fondness for any one pursuit, nor are they brought to understand what learning means. They do not enter into the spirit of anything. Hence the great majority of young men who have graduated at college, never think of reading a page of Latin or Greek, or of opening a book of science or philosophy, after the day they received the coveted parchment. The reason is, that many of them have not familiarity enough with any of these subjects to relieve the study of them from the merest drudgery. They fall into a routine of professional study or of business, and are very soon behind the age. They do not refresh their minds from the wide fields of science and standard literature, they do not rouse their intellects by grappling with the deep problems of philosophy, all because, in many instances, the college training was too shallow and superficial to awaken a love and form a proper taste for these studies. Now what is needed in order to furnish the Church an efficient ministry, is not less Latin, or Greek, or Mathemathics, but vastly more science and philosophy.* Instead of four years in college we need and should have *six.* Instead of a smattering of Geology, Chemistry and Physics, and a hasty perusal of one small book on Mental Philosophy and Logic, we should have our young men who are in training for the Church, look back of the superficial phenomena of matter and mind, to a careful and systematic study of the great laws and principles which condition all phenomena and connect them with God. Above all things, the Church wants more men who can think independently, originally, and coherently on these great living subjects, which are enter-

* In Philosophy and Logic we are far behind the English and Scotch Universities.

ing as most important factors into the civilization and religion of our times. She wants men, too, who have not the verdancy and inexperience of youth, but the wisdom and prudence of a trained and cultured manhood. In order to supply these wants, the Church must first repress the ardor, with which half-educated and even uneducated young men are striving to force their way into the ministry; and, secondly, she must lay down a course of study which will best suit her own great interests, and which will always be the broadest and most liberal possible—a course which will give, first, severe and correct discipline as the paramount requisite of an education, and, secondly, which will embrace a wide range of facts and principles. Then when she has provided in her colleges the very best means for full and thorough training, she should urge the completion of the course upon all who aspire to minister at her altars. Even against the protest, sometimes raised, that young men are burning with zeal to get into the field, and are losing much valuable time by protracted study, the Church should insist that the best economy of time is time spent in extended and thoughtful preparation, as quality of service is more important than quantity, and as one great want of the Church is not mere preaching, but better preaching. And indeed both are quality improved and quantity increased, when the workman is thoroughly skilled in the use of his implements, and is master of his trade, since it is not the disorderly and random strokes, however hard they may be, but the orderly and well-directed ones, which produce the best and most lasting results. *Miles, Feri faciem*, shouted Cæsar at the great battle of Pharsalia. This made him master of the Roman world. It is the strokes of the preacher that are directed intelligently at the vulnerable places, which will win the victory.

Bearing in mind that nine-tenths of our Universities and Colleges exist for and by the Church, it becomes an important question, whether these institutions are fully meeting the wants of the Church. For one, we answer, No. The training is too limited and superficial. It covers subjects enough, but it does not extend far enough into these subjects. We

have multiplied Colleges so rapidly, and seem so ambitious to place diplomas in the hands of the greatest possible number, that we have, to a large extent, lost sight of the true object of education. Certain it is, that we have not kept up a high standard of scholarship, and have justly exposed ourselves to not a little criticism from educators and scholars across the Atlantic. Hence, no wonder that Presidents Eliot, White, *et alii*, are attacking the "small Colleges," which seem indeed to be *huckstering* education rather than *educating*. Now, such a course of academic study as we have briefly indicated, and which we believe to be altogether possible, would furnish the proper preliminary training for the more successful and profitable study of theology. Less than this cannot cut off sciolism and come up to the full measure of the Church's wants. With less than this the Church may indeed maintain her existence and still do a grand work, but she cannot meet her great responsibility.

But we have not yet given the final answer to our question. It is,

III. BY MAKING THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION MORE GENERAL AND THOROUGH.

The training of the College can only lay the foundation on which the professional superstructure is to be erected. The real and final qualification of the preacher, consists in his systematic and thorough acquaintance with the great doctrines of the Bible, that he may know how to divide the word of truth, and how to teach the one only way of salvation. The New Testament idea of preaching is nothing else than the presentation of doctrines. This is seen in all the discourses of the Master in unfolding the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, and also in the discourses of the apostles, as witness Peter on the day of Pentecost and before Cornelius, and Paul at Salamis "preaching the word of God," at Thessalonica "reasoning out the Scriptures," at Athens, the very metropolis of classical refinement, "preaching Jesus and the resurrection," and from the "midst of Mars Hill" setting

forth that sublime vindication of the personality, sovereignty and spirituality of God,* at Ephesus, "disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God," everywhere, indeed, "testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ." It was always the *doctrines.* The same thing appears also in the apostolic epistles. They are the unfolding of the great plan of salvation, as taught by Jesus Christ, in fulfilment of type and shadow and prophecy. But the great deficiency in the preaching of to-day, is in the element of theology. *Much of it has but little foundation in the word of God.* Much of it, especially in our cities, is a weak and emasculated kind of morality, which makes the hearers thereof little or no wiser in the matter of their relations to God. There is also among the people a morbid craving for something new and striking, something that will please the fancy or flatter the vanity. The demand has produced the supply, and, instead of the great doctrines of God, presented in plain and popular language, we have too often essays and declamations, which, for all the purposes of awakening the fear and love of God, or of producing faith in Christ, or of stimulating to a virtuous and holy life, might be supplanted by a chapter from Aristotle's Ethics, or Cicero's Offices, or by a poem from Tennyson or Lowell.† It is on this account that many are weak and sickly, and many sleep, and that the pulpit has lost much of the influence and power which it once enjoyed. Often a text is taken from the Bible and is made the heading or motto of what is called a sermon, but the discourse itself is something so foreign to the thought and spirit of the text, and contains so little of the real marrow of the Gospel, that whole acres of such would not conduct a lost soul into the way of salvation.

The only way, as we see, by which this evil can be corrected and the pulpit put in possession of its lost prestige, and be made to rise again to that influence which once it com-

---

* See Lange on Acts.

† The writer knows of a pulpit in which the evening service often consists mainly of readings from the poets.

manded, and which it ought always to command, is to give our candidates for the ministry a more thorough training in *systematic divinity*, that they may know what the *doctrines* are, and that they may be able to state them more clearly, and to press them with more vigor upon the reason and consciences of their hearers.

The feeling against doctrinal preaching is one of the mawkish sentimentalities of the day. People call for sermons on moral and social subjects, but dislike to hear of sin and holiness, death, judgment and hell. But no preaching is preaching, which does not tell the whole truth about God, and enforce all duties, moral, social and religious, with a "thus saith the Lord." This gives preaching its authority and makes men fear and obey. But only they who know by systematic study what the doctrines are, can present them as they ought to be presented. And yet in some places we are allowing young men to press into this great and responsible work of preaching the Gospel, who have only the most limited, and in some cases, no theological training. We have men in our ministry to-day, (and in this respect we are not different from other churches), who cannot state systematically and defend scientifically a single fundamental doctrine of the divine word. Many who fail or despair of success in other pursuits, imagine they have a special vocation to preach the Gospel, and, accordingly, present themselves for ordination, and then go forth on the grandest commission that ever employed the talents and faculties of man, both without the discipline necessary to secure coherent thought, and without sufficient knowledge of the word of God to protect themselves from all kinds of looseness in practice and error in doctrine. Hence the disorderly character of some congregations, and the little regard paid to the decisions of ecclesiastical judicatories. We sow the wind, we reap the whirlwind.

We seem sometimes to lose sight of the fact that the subjects of theology are the profoundest that can engage the mind and study of man, that they relate to God, the Incarnate Word, the Holy Ghost, the human soul, sin, judgment,

eternity, that even an angel might stand appalled before any one of these subjects, and so we often admit young men to the handling and exposition of these great themes, who cannot even give acceptable definitions to the words, much less would they be able to teach the doctrines with any tolerable degree of accuracy. The truth is, that while the clergy has in all ages been in possession of the great mass of the profoundest learning, there has always been found in its ranks the greatest amount of slender *professional* training. It is undeniable, that men are ordained and sent forth to preach the everlasting Gospel, who, if they bore the same relation to the study of medicine, or the law, could not obtain admission to the college of physicians, or to the bar of the courts. The learned professions of the law and of medicine carefully guard themselves from professional ignorance and charlatanry, but the ministry, with objects and aims infinitely higher, has *maintained* no just and adequate standard of qualification for admission into her ranks. It is true the constitution of our Synods requires that each candidate for the sacred office shall be examined in the original languages of the inspired Scriptures, Theology, Church History, Pastoral Theology, Homiletics, and Church Government. This comprehends a large amount of professional training, but it does not go beyond the wants of the Church. Nor does the constitution make provision for a less amount, but it expressly says that the examination shall embrace *at least* these subjects. But we know that in some of our synods this rule has been honored quite as frequently in the breach as in the observance. The writer has been witness to the fact that men have been brought into the ministry, who not only could not sustain an examination on any of these subjects, but who could not even speak and write the English language with propriety. Now if it be said that strict adherence to this rule adopted by the synods, would have excluded from the ministry many men who have done good service, yea, in some instances, even better service than many who have come up to the full measure of the requirements, we reply, first, that if it would have excluded some useful and very successful men

from the ministry who are now in it, it would doubtless have given us many young men of good talents and fine scholarship, who have been kept out of the ministry by the unfavorable impressions made by some unworthy representatives, and, secondly, that we are making no attack upon those of our brethren whose qualifications for their work are limited, and who have done the best they could, but we are finding fault with the synods who have been unfaithful to the Church, and unfaithful to those very brethren, in that they did not provide for them the means of thorough preparation, but suffered them in their zeal without knowledge to enter the ministry to their own and the Church's great detriment. It is with the synods and the men who *know* better, that the blame must rest, and from this source the remedy must come. And if it be said that there is danger of quenching the operations of the Spirit, and of putting a call to the ministry on a level with secular business, then we reply, that the Spirit never operates except through the word, and that this call to the ministry comes through the Church, which has the word, and that in choosing a minister, the word should be our guide. But the inspired word, neither by precept nor by example, justifies ignorance in the ministry. The Saviour had his disciples under him three years and a half, during which He taught them the things pertaining to the kingdom, and then endowed them with the gift of all tongues, and the special power of the Holy Ghost, who would lead them in the way of all truth and bring to their minds whatsoever He Himself had spoken to them. Here we have an example of professional training for the ministry, which can never be gainsaid, but which must guide us to the end of time. Take the case of Paul, who was educated in the famous schools of Tarsus and at the feet of Gamaliel. Before he was permitted to enter the apostolate, he must spend three years in the solitudes of Arabia. Take the companions of Paul, Timothy, who had known the Scriptures from childhood, Apollos, "a learned man," Barnabas, son of prophecy, or hear Paul's instructions about the selection of ministers, "Apt to teach," "Not a novice," "Able by sound doctrine to exhort and con-

vince the gainsayers;" or listen to his sharp and pungent rebukes against ignorance, shallowness, prating, and "vain babblings," and surely we will find in all this small reason for trying to justify our mistakes by appealing to our fears of offending the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost makes no mistakes, but we have made mistakes, and that, simply, because we have not heeded the *word* through which the Holy Ghost breathes and operates. Nor does the fact that there is great need of men, justify the lowering of the standard of qualifications. When Christ called the attention of His disciples to the fields white unto the harvest, he did not bid them go and cast in the sickle, but to *pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth reapers.* As for themselves, they must abide the time of their preparation. A little less haste and a little more prayer, on our part, and the Church will not lack an able and well-qualified ministry.

Now, if against all this it be said that a highly educated ministry will be tempted to preach great sermons, then I reply, That is what the Church and the world need. They need great sermons filled with the great doctrines of God's word. The principal deficiency of this age is, that there are not great sermons enough, that men are not sufficiently instructed in the grand and soul-stirring doctrines of the nature and attributes of God, his holiness, justice, love, and mercy, in the doctrines of sin, the incarnation, the atonement, justification. If these things be realities, with which men will have to do, both here and hereafter, then the more they hear and know of them the better. Great preaching is nothing else than the faithful heralding of the eternal verities of God with freshness and vigor of thought, with simplicity of language and aptness of illustration. Only those who have clearly apprehended these verities, can set them forth intelligently and forcibly. They who conceive of them darkly, will express them in misty and uncertain language, which may leave men's souls in doubt or in error.

As our schools and colleges are diffusing popular intelligence and producing independence of thought, as many are running to and fro, as knowledge is increasing and wicked-

ness abounding, what is needed from the pulpit is more of the sincere milk and strong meat of God's word, that men's consciences may be quickened and their thirst for knowledge gratified. The Church and the times need more *intellectual* preachers, who, like Christ and the apostles, will rouse and stimulate thought—preachers who will reach men's hearts and stir their wills by enlightening their minds and informing their judgments—preachers who will not deal in platitudes, nor relate anecdotes, nor pander to the corrupt and vitiated tastes of a novel-reading and sensation-loving audience, but who will hurl forth the solid truths of God's word as hard as cannon-balls. The Church and the times need men who can thunder from Sinai or plead in tenderest tones of love from Calvary—men who can speak to the king on his throne, or to the peasant in his hut, and who can rebuke sin in high places, and in low, with all long-suffering and *doctrine.* There is great need of men who can take care of the flock of God and rule over the Church. There is need of more strictly *professional* work in our churches, performed by men who know the duties of their profession, and who have been taught by the best masters how to perform them. All this is what the age needs, instead of the loose doctrine, and sentimental declamation, and moral cowardice, and lax government, which lull men's consciences, and please their fancies, and connive at their sins, and let the churches run into disorder.

And if this be the objection to thorough theological training, then, for the sake of the Church and the good of dying men, let us have more of it; let us make every preacher a theologian; let us follow the example of the Master and His inspired apostles in the selection of religious teachers, and send into the pulpit only men who hold fast the faithful word of God as it hath been *taught* them, that they may be able, by sound *doctrine*, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayer.

So much have we said of the importance of theological training in general. But, as Lutherans, we dare not ignore the great doctrinal system of our own Church, unquestiona-

bly the grandest, the most complete, and the most evangelical in the world. Its Confession stands notably at the head of all Protestant theology. Of it the learned Dr. Schaff has said: "It is the only Confession on which all Protestants could unite." Of our symbols in general, it may be said that they form the best body of divinity, so far as they go, in the whole range of theological literature, and that after three hundred years, they stand above refutation. They may not in every particular be *absolutely* perfect, but next to the Bible, the Book of Concord* contains more sound theology, more practical soul-comforting truth, and more reverence of spirit, that any other volume that has ever been written by man. Hence the theology that is based upon it is the ruling theology of the world. New England talks a great deal about German theology, and sends her theologians across the waters to study it. But we all know that the theology of Germany is nothing more of less than the theology of the Lutheran Confessions, and that the great theologians of Germany, both past and present, with only rare exceptions, have been and are Lutherans.† Therefore we have a heritage and a birthright in German theology which we ought not to surrender to another. Indeed we can no longer afford that our students for the ministry, and our people, shall receive their knowledge of Lutheran theology from Buck's Theological Dictionary, Watson's Institutes, and Shedd's History of Doc-

---

* This book ought to be in the hands of every Lutheran minister, and yet the writer knows whole synods in which not above two or three copies can be found. Young men leave some of our theological seminaries who have scarcely heard the names of the great dogmaticians, Chemnitz, Gerhard, Quenstedt. We have been so ambitious of being not very different from other people, that we have been in danger of losing our identity and forgetting our history.

†It is not a little humiliating to see such works as Martensen's Dogmatic introduced to English readers with a caution against its Lutheranism, and to find other Lutheran books in which the ecclesiastical status of the authors is purposely ignored, and, as has recently been the case, one from which the Lutheran sentiments have been expurgated and their place supplied with Calvinistic sentiments. Is this honest? Is it Christian?

trines, but from the original sources of our theology, now accessible to every Lutheran, either in the originals or in trustworthy translations. We need to have the young men in our theological seminaries more deeply imbued with the spirit of the AUGUSTANA, from which Arndt drew his True Christianity, and Spener and Francke the means of breaking the iron bands of the dead orthodoxy of the seventeenth century, and upon the Fourth Article of which Harms planted his cannon when he thundered against Rationalism, in 1817. This Confession is, and will ever remain, the great thesaurus of Protestantism, and the mightiest bulwark against Rome. Fidelity to the past, and a wise policy for the future of our Church in this country where, on the list of Protestant denominations, we stand third, demands from us a more careful indoctrination of our young clergy in the principles, doctrines and practices of the fathers, that they may be made more Lutheran without being less Christian, more denominational without being less liberal and catholic; for spiritual Christianity and broad Catholicity are of the very essence of genuine Lutheranism. This is one of the duties laid upon *us* in answering the question, How shall *we* train the ministry for the times; for if we as a Church have a mission in this country, we can best discharge the duties of that mission by being true to our name, our history, and our antecedents.

ARTICLE II.

ANSGAR.

*Translated from the German of Rev. Alexander Michelsen, of Lübeck, by Rev. G. F. BEHRINGER, Indianapolis, Ind.

Ansgar, (derived from Aasgejr or Osgejr = Oskar, *i. e.* God's spear) is the name of the man, who, celebrated as the Apostle of the North, occupies a prominent position among God's instruments for Christianizing the Germanic nations.

*From "Herzog's Real-Encyclopædia," Vol. I., p. 439—445, 2d Edition.

At the time of Charlemagne, Northern Europe was inhabited by three branches of the North-Germanic races: the Danes, the Swedes, and the Norwegians (Normans or Northmen). Their religion, the so-called "Asa-Faith," was a form of religious belief peculiarly developed under the influence of northern nature and northern national life; its characteristic features were common to all the Germanic peoples. This popular faith or national religion has been preserved in the Old-Norse songs and sagas, committed to writing at an early day in the Old-Norse or Icelandic language, in the so-called Eddas. The older Edda (ancestress or grandmother)—also called Saemund's Edda, after its supposed compiler, Priest Saemund the Learned, about 1200 A. D.—is composed of parts, whose age extends beyond the Christian times, and of sagas, that sprang directly from original heathenism. The younger Edda, or Snorre's Edda, called so after the alleged compiler Snorre Sturleson (died 1241 A. D.), is of later origin and of less importance.

According to the conception of the Northmen, there were in the beginning two worlds: Muspelheim (or Muspilli, i. e. the Fire-world) and Niflheim (*i. e.* the Fog-world). The heat from Muspelheim met the cold from Niflheim in the fathomless abyss: Ginnunggapap, and from their contact there proceeded the giant Yuce (Yætte), the ancestor of all giants (nature's untamed forces), and of the cow, Œedhumla; from the union of the latter two, the gods, or demi-gods, derive their origin.

The most important gods were: Odin, the All-father; Thor, the mighty god of war; Balder, the god of piety, gentleness, and innocence; Njard, controller of the air and of the winds; and Froe, the lord of the rain and of the sunshine; Brage god of song, (the art of the scalds); and Hejmdall, heaven's watchman at the bridge, Bifrœest (*i. e.* the rainbow). The most distinguished goddesses were: Frigga, Odin's wife; Froeja, goddess of love; and Iduna; who guards the apples of youth.

The evil-minded Loke caused strife and dissension among the gods. He enticed the blind Hoeder to kill the noble Balder. Thereupon Ragnarœk appears (*i. e.* the great night

of the gods), and the old world passes away. The present condition of things is a state of imperfection and corruption. But out of the sea will finally arise a "new earth," over which a mighty God shall reign. Thus the old Norse mythology begins with a Genesis and closes with an Apocalypse, the promise of a more perfect world.

The belief in the immortality of the soul was received by the Northmen more clearly and more positively than by the majority of other heathen nations. They did not, as did the Greeks, regard the hereafter as a miserable "shadow-life," but rather as an active, stirring life with Odin, consecrated to conflict, in the golden Valhalla. In fact it was the worth of the personality, the development of freedom, of the power of the will and of human activity, upon which the mind of these nations was concentrated—indeed without limit or restraint, often degenerating into adventurous, wild and savage doings, though with a profound ethical tendency, which manifested itself principally as fidelity.

Woman enjoyed great respect in the Northland and the wife was the equal of the husband.

The brotherhood of the clans united the heroes to each other by the tenderest ties of friendship, and bound them to follow one another even unto death.

It was a sacred custom to pour water over a new-born child ; so likewise to make "Thor's hammer-sign," the sign of the cross, upon the drinking horn at the meeting of the "guilds." There were therefore not wanting, in the Norse conceptions and usages, types and presentiments of the truths, of such traces of that λόγος σπερματικός with which the missionary might connect his message, though indeed there were also not wanting such as did not desire either to hear or to know of any other deity than their own heroic power.

The gods were worshipped under the open sky, at the altar of sacrifice ("Harg"), in part also in the temple ("Gudehove," *i. e.* the court of God), where likewise the pictures of the deities were placed. The most important temples in the North, in which the "Thinge," (courts or councils), were held, were located at Upsala, at Lejre (near Raskilde), and

at Moere, by Trondhjem (Drantheim). The chieftains of the people were at the same time officers in the temple, and, because of the simplicity of the divine service, there was no need of a special priestly class. The great yearly sacrificial festivals (Blot) took place in Spring and Autumn, as well as at the Yule-tide (Winter solstice). But a particularly sacred festival occurred every ninth year. As a rule, animals were sacrificed (horses and cocks), at times human beings (slaves, criminals, and prisoners of war). Indeed, tradition relates, that even kings were offered up by their own people to appease the gods.

The Danes, as well as the Northmen generally, came in contact with Christianity at a very early day; the former on their commercial voyages, the latter in the piratical expeditions of the Vikings. Duerstede (Darstad), situated somewhat north of Utrecht, a city much frequented by northern traders, afforded hereunto special opportunity. And the report concerning the "white Christ" was spread over the entire North.

The first missionary, that ventured to cross the much-dreaded boundary line of the Danes, was Willebrard of Northumberland. Dedicated in youth, by a pious mother, to the service of the Lord, educated by the Culdees of Ireland, he began his activity in the year 690 A. D., in Frisia. But driven thence he went to Denmark, where he purchased thirty boys and educated them as Christians—one of these, according to tradition, is said to have been Sigwald, son of the Danish king, afterwards St. Sebaldees, whom Nuremberg honors as its Apostle. About the year 700 A. D., Willebrard visited a certain king Yugrim (Ongendus), at whose court a congregation seems to have organized. One hundred years thereafter, the Frisian Bishop, Ljudger, determined to enter Denmark, but was not permitted.

In reality, a Danish mission was first established in consequence of certain political relations that existed between the Danish and the German Imperial Courts. At the latter court wishes to the above effect had already been entertained

at an early date. In a letter of Alcuin (730 A. D.) to a worthy clergyman in Saxony,* there is asked the question: whether there be any hope ever to see the Danes converted. Charlemagne seems to have done nothing further in this direction. than to have established a chapel for the garrison at Essehœ (Itzehœ), about the year 809 A. D , and to havel, ocated the distinguished priest, Heridack, at Hamburg.

Under his successor, Ludwig the Pious, the contentions concerning the hereditary succession in Denmark, and the appeal for assistance coming from Harald (a Prince of Jutland) of the House of Halfdan, gave the Emperor occasion to send an embassy to him. For this purpose he selected the Archbishop of Ebo of Rheims, a man aglow with missionary zeal as well as experienced in business affairs. Endowed with plenary powers from Pope Paschalis I., he crossed the Eider in the year 823 A. D.—Accompanied for a time by Bishop Haltigar of Cambray, he baptized a number of Danes and took home with him several boys, whom he educated as teachers for their own people. Welanao, (the present village of Münster), not far from Essehœ, served as his base of operations; here he erected a cloister. He retained a life-long interest in the Danish mission, altbough, becoming involved in the internal dissensions of France he could not personally, continue in the work begun by himself.

When, in the year 826 A. D., the Emperor held an Imperial Diet, at Ingelenheim, (the present Lower-Ingelheim), not far from Mayence, King Harald, with his wife, son, and a large retinue of followers, attended the same. In St. Alban's Minster, south of golden Mayence, the king with his attendants, amidst great solemnity, was received into the bosom of the church. Now, however, it became a matter of importance, to procure servants of Christ, who should be adapted to the work of accompanying these Danes, hardly fixed in the faith, to their distant homes, and to establish among their people the dominion of the Cross. For this purpose *Ansgar* was chosen.

---

* Vide Jaffé, Monumenta Alcuiniana, p. 165, epist. 13.

Ansgar, the son of Frankish parents, was born about the the year 800 A. D.—the date usually accepted being Sept. 9th, 801 A. D.—not far from the cloister Corvey, belonging to the diocese of Amiens. Under the influence of an excellent mother, whom, however, he had the misfortune to lose at the age of five, his mind was inclined in early youth to quiet, religious meditation and prayer, not without a tendency to visionary piety, which in those days often showed itself united with clearness of understanding and practical thoroughness. His inner life began to be outwardly reflected in visions, regarded by him as divinely sent. He beheld in a vision the Holy Virgin, who commanded him to flee the vanity of the world, in order that he might become worthy to meet his departed mother in heaven. Soon thereafter he entered the above named cloister, which, being transformed into a Benedictine Abbey, became the seat of earnest piety, and, according to the standard of that age, of thorough scientific education, where men like Paschasius Radbertus prepared the youth for the service of Church and State. The abbot Adalhard, a relative of Charlemagne, associated with his brother Wala in the government of the cloister, had special charge of Ansgar's training.

The news of the Emperor's death, whom the boy Ansgar had once seen in power and glory, deeply impressed him with the emptiness of all earthly things. After this he had various visions, now warning and then frightening him, at times exalted by the pardoning assurance of the Redeemer, or by a vision of the brightness and glory of heaven.*

It was about this time that he conceived the hope, retained unto old age, of gaining the crown of martyrdom.

In the year 822 A. D., a colony from Corbie was sent out to found the German cloister of Corvey, in Westphalia, for the purpose of exerting a Christian influence upon the Saxon population. In company with other monks, Ansgar was ordered thither in 823 A. D., when he was appointed not only to the position of Scholasticus, (*i. e.* Rector of the school)

*Vide Rimberti Vita Ansg. cap. II.

but also as preacher to the people in the convent church, because of his eloquence. Already at that time, did he reveal the wonderful gift of attracting others and of influencing them in a soothing manner.

It was in the year 826 A. D , that King Harald desired to take with him to his home a missionary. Ansgar, to whom was offered this difficult and dangerous mission, accepted it with joy, in spite of all dissuasions. Among his most trusted friends was the excellent friar Autbert, likewise of a distinguished, highly respected family, at the court of the Frankish kings. The latter declared that his heart would not permit him to let the beloved brother depart alone; he would go with him as his faithful companion. Thus, in a fraternal manner, they entered upon their journey, descending the Rhine. In the beginning, they were much annoyed by the uncivil behavior of the king; but their mildness conquered him. Passing Cologne and Dœrstade, they entered, as it is supposed, the mouth of the Weser, in whose vicinity lay the dukedom of Riustri (Ruestringen), which the Emperor Ludwig had bestowed upon King Harald in fee, to serve the latter, in case of necessity, as a place of refuge.* They tarried for some time on the then Saxon-Danish border, in the commercial town of Sliaswich (Schleswig) according to the German, Haddelbye (Heithaby) according to the Old-Norse appellation. This appears to have been the central point of their missionary activity, beginning with the year 827 A. D. Here they purchased and instructed Danish children, ransomed prisoners of war, rendered assistance to the poor, and preached round about in the country. They educated twelve native boys for the ministerial office, and also gained accessions to their ranks from Germany. Ansgar's personality won every one with whom he came in contact. Notwithstanding many warlike feuds, through which their settlement was often threatened, they succeeded in making numerous conversions. But soon Harald was compelled to flee the country, and to seek the above-mentioned place of

*Vide Pertz, Monum. Vol. II., p. 466 sqq.

refuge.* It was now impossible for these Christian teachers to continue their activity at that point, and accordingly Ansgar and Autbert followed the king. After co-operating for at least two years with his great friend, the latter was obliged to return to Corvey, on account of physical infirmity, where he died soon thereafter, in the year 829 A. D. King Harald, in later years, as partisan of the Emperor Lothaire, relapsed into heathenism.

After Autbert's death, there came to the Emperor Ludwig, from the Swedish King Bjœrn, ambassadors, who announced, that, not only through traders, but also through prisoners, the desire for the Gospel had been awakened among his people, and the wish expressed that missionaries might be sent to them. The result was that Ansgar, accompanied by Witmar, his former associate at the convent school, was ordered from Corvey to Sweden. On their voyage they were attacked and plundered by Vikings. Nothing daunted, they arrived at last, safe and sound, after a trying and tedious journey, at the city of Bjœrkœ, on Lake Mælar,—situated upon an island, sometimes identified with Birka, incorrectly with Sigtuna. Here the king received the empty-handed missionaries in a friendly manner. The chieftain of that region, the king's confidential councilor, Hergejr (Heriger), built for them a chapel upon his own land, shortly after the successful beginning of their mission. He, and others that were baptized with him, remained faithful to Ansgar and to the Christian religion from that time forward. Ansgar spent two winters in Sweden. In the year 831 A. D., he returned home, in order to report to the Emperor concerning the success of the mission.

About this time there was carried out a plan, important for the success of the Norse mission, whose conception is attributed to Charlemagne, and for whose execution his son Ludwig had now found the right man. This was the establishing of a bishopric in Hamburg. Before the return of Ansgar, the imperial diet at Aix-la-Chapelle, 831 A. D., had

* Vide Pertz Monum. Vol. I., p. 638.

determined upon the matter. It was intended that this new bishopric should include Northalbingia, *i. e.* Stormarm, Holstein and Ditmarsh. The brother of the Emperor, bishop Drogo, of Metz, assisted by three Arch-bishops: Ebo, of Rheims, Hetti, of Treves, and Otgar, of Mayence, consecrated the new bishop. Without doubt the reason of this unusually solemn consecration lay in the thought, that the bishop of Hamburg was destined to assume arch-episcopal functions, and that Hamburg would become the ecclesiastical metropolis for the whole of Scandinavia. A bull of Gregory IV.* confirmed the imperial arrangement. It is said that Ansgar received the pallium in Rome, from the hands of the pope himself. A few years thereafter, in May, 834 A. D., the Emperor Ludwig bestowed upon the new bishopric the rich cloister of Thorout (Turholt) in West Flanders, south of Bruges, to serve as a certain source of revenue, and at the same time as a place of refuge in times of danger. Somewhat later, the pope appointed a near relative of Ebo's, named Gauzbert (called Gautbert in the Northland), as leader of the Norse Mission, and bestowed upon him Welanao or Welnau, at present the village of Münster, near Itzehoe, as his special base of operations. He built a church at Bjœrkœ, and appears to have discharged the duties of his office in peace for several years. In the meanwhile a hostile heathen party was forming, and at last the storm broke out in fury. During the persecution that ensued, one of Gauzbert's assistant priests was killed. He himself was forced to give up the Swedish mission, and was afterwards made Bishop of Osnabrück.

About this time (845 A. D.), Hamburg, the point of departure and seat of the Danish mission, also received a severe blow. Heathen hordes filling six hundred vessels, approached the city by the way of the Elbe, commanded by Haarichœ I. (Harichs), king of the Danish west-kingdom, who fell upon that military depot and mission-station, intending thereby to

*Vide Mabillon, Acta Sanct. Bened. Ord. IV., II., p. 124.

avenge the victory, which Ludwig the German had won over the neighboring Wends. The city, with its surroundings, was terribly plundered and then destroyed. The Church built by Ansgar, his cloister, library, and a copy of the Holy Scriptures presented to him by Ludwig the Pious, became a prey to the flames. Seeking refuge with his neighbor, bishop Leuderich of Bremen, he was repulsed by him in a shameful manner. Even the revenues of Thorout were lost, since Charles the Bald had bestowed that cloister upon one of his feudal lords. Ansgar, poor and helpless, fleeing from place to place, saving nothing but his precious relics of the saints, was now deserted by many of his associate laborers. But he was silent and endured.

Ludwig, the German, endeavored first of all to regain for him possession of Thorout. Failing in this he appointed Ansgar to the vacant bishopric of Bremen. The see of Hamburg was abolished and its jurisdiction divided between Verden and Bremen. Ansgar had serious misgivings in thus passing from one church to another, which however were quieted by a vision granted to him. In a bull of May 31st, 864 A. D., Pope Nicholas I. ordered that the dioceses of Hamburg and Bremen should be one, acknowledging the arch-episcopal rank of the former, and restoring to the diocese of Verden that part which had been taken away from it and connected with Hamburg.

Upon this declaration rested the arch-episcopal rank and station which Ansgar himself, as well as his followers, assumed. But whilst this new order of things was thus being established, Ansgar continued to labor with great fidelity upon the chief aim of his life. As soon as he had located himself in Bremen, the mission cause felt a new impetus. He now appears as prince of the Church, and, as the custom of the country demanded, recommended himself to the court and its nobles by presents; but especially by his mild and venerable personality did he gain such an influence upon King Haarick that he received permission to build a church in Haddebye on the Schlei. This first Danish cathedral, like the mother-church in Hamburg, was dedicated to "Our

Ladies" (women). From that time onward, Christianity was publicly recognized as an established religion alongside of the old popular faith, and the Church could progress in peace. After Haarik's death there came again a time of persecution and great distress, which, however, did not continue very long. For the successor, King Haarik the Younger, soon took a friendly position over against Christianity, and openly testified: "That he had never seen so good a man as Ansgar." He permitted the church at Haddebye to receive a chime of bells so timidly feared by the heathen. Besides this, a plot of ground was set apart in the city of Ribe for the building of a large church.

With all this Ansgar, however, did not forget the Christian congregation in Sweden, which Gauzbert was obliged to forsake. He sent, first of all, to Bjœrkœ, a hermit priest named Ardgar. Then he went there himself in company with Erimbert, a relative of Gauzbert's (848—850 A. D.) The moment of his arrival was a critical one, and the condition of things difficult to manage. It was said that the gods were angry because their worship had been neglected. But a short time before this the national council, presided over by King Olof, had elevated a deceased king to the rank of a god. In short a heathen reaction made itself felt. Thereupon the king submitted the question to the popular assembly whether they would suffer Christ to be preached. In reply an aged sire arose and cited examples of the power of the Christian's God. It was therefore determined that the preaching of the Gospel might be continued, and that nothing should hinder the administration of the sacraments. Erimbert, as head of the mission, remained with several assistants in Sweden, whilst Ansgar, on account of other official duties was obliged to depart.

Having arrived at home, Ansgar manifested in various ways, until the end of life, the true priestly spirit which inspired him. In Bremen he founded an asylum for the sick and for the stranger. To the poor he gave rich gifts, and washed their feet. He ransomed prisoners and educated boys to become missionaries. He retained a special love for

monastic and hermit life. He visited the pious Luizbirga, in the valley of the Bode (Harz mountains), and committed young maidens to her care, to be trained in singing spiritual songs, in domestic acquirements and artistic accomplishments. He himself loved to knit nets amidst prayer and meditation. He made it a duty for the missionaries to imitate his own unselfishness, in not accepting any gifts from the converts, and in supporting themselves with the labor of their own hands. He regarded Martin of Tours, who had been transformed from a heathen warrior into a tender-hearted bishop as his. He wore continually a coarse hair-cloth shirt, fasted rigorously, prayed and sang a great deal. Those who would have glorified him as a worker of miracles, he rebuked with the words: "The greatest wonder it will be if God would yet make of me a truly pious man." When the temptation came upon him to consider himself above all others among the elect, he was very deeply humbled by a vision. So, too, it required a vision to pacify him that he was not to die the death of a martyr. Before the end of his life, in a short letter that has been preserved, he affectionately and earnestly commended to the German bishops and to Ludwig the German, the interests of the Norse mission, and his own bishopric as the central point of the same. Amidst exhortations to Rimbert of Flanders, the dearest of his scholars, and to others, amidst the songs and prayers of his friends, strengthened by choice passages of the Holy Scriptures, Ansgar died in peace, Feb. 3d, 865 A. D., in Bremen, where he was buried on the following day. Pope Nicholas I. canonized him not long thereafter. Rimbert, priest at Ribe, became his successor. What Ebo of Rheims had predicted in troublous times was fulfilled, and has continued to fulfil itself more and more gloriously: "That the work begun by them to the honor of the name of Christ, should not pass away, but flourish and bear fruit, until the name of the Lord should penetrate unto the borders of the earth." In memory of Ansgar, the 3d of February (and in some parts also the 4th of February) was celebrated in an especial manner by the churches of the Northland. In the year 1826, as well as in 1834, Scandinavia com-

memorated the millennial jubilee of the introduction of Christianity.

A collection of short prayers, written by Ansgar, and connected with the Psalms of David, under the title of "Pigmenta," (Balsam), has been preserved; also a life of Willehad, first bishop of Bremen,* which affords evidence that Ansgar was in all respects fully possessed of the learning of his times.

ARTICLE III.

"ASCENSIO ISAIÆ."

Translated from the critical edition of the Ethiopic text of Prof. Dillmann, by Rev. Geo. H. Schodde, A. M., Ph. D., Martin's Ferry, Ohio.

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

1. The earliest testimony of an apocryphal work attributed to Isaiah, is found in the *Dialogus cum Typhone* of Justin Martyr, who speaks c. 120, of Isaiah, *ὃν πρίονι ξυλίνῳ ἐπρίσατε.* The quotation is not, indeed, a direct one, but its peculiar wording points to the first part of the *Ascensio* as its source, as the Jewish traditions concerning the death of Isaiah do not say that he was sawn asunder by a wooden saw, but, that, when Isaiah was pressed by his enemies, a cedar- (or a carob-) tree "opened and swallowed him," and that this tree was sawn through, and Isaiah perished in this manner. Soon after, Tertullian, in his *de Patientia*, c. 14, makes the remark: "His patientiæ viribus secatur Esaias et de Domino non tacet," evidently referring to chap. 5, v. 14 of the *Ascensio.* Then in the Apostolic Constitutions is mentioned an "*ἀπόκρυφον Ἠσαΐου.*" The existence of this work is made certain by the two citations by Origen, *Comm. in Matth.* 13 : 57, and *Epist. ad African.*, c. 9, where it is both times quoted as *ἀπόκρυφον Ἠσαΐου.* The same writer, in his homily on Is. 1, without mentioning the source, quotes chap. 3 : 8, 9 of the *Ascensio.* Epiphanius, when speaking of the *ἀρχοντικοί,*

---

* Pertz Monumenta, II.

says their heresy was partly taken from the *ἀναβατικὸν Ἠσαιου,* and quotes from it chap. 9 : 27, 32—36; chap. 11 : 32, 33, again as the *ἀναβατικὸν Ἠσαιου.* Again, chap. 5 : 4, 8, is virtually quoted by Ambrose, in his commentary on Ps. 118. In an imperfect commentary upon Matthew, inserted among the works of Chrysostom, are found almost the very words of chap. 1 : 1, 2, 4, 7, 12, 13. Here, too, the name Manasseh is explained, by deriving it from נשה, *oblivisci.* Much later, in the catalogue of Euthymius Zigabenus, mention is made of the *ὅρασις Ἠσαιου,* evidently referring to the second part of the *Ascensio*, chap. 6 seq., while the *διαθήκη Ἑζεχίου* of Georgius Cedrenus refers to the first part.

This important apocryphal seemed to have been lost, until Richard Laurence, Regius Professor of Hebrew in Oxford, discovered an Ethiopic copy of it in the Bodleiana, and published it, with a Latin and an English translation, in 1819. Text and translation, considering that he had but one MS., and only Ludolf to guide him in his Ethiopic studies, are good, although containing some disastrous mistakes. This remained the only edition of the text till the master-hand of Prof. Dillmann undertook to issue a thoroughly revised edition. Having now *three* MSS. to consult, and a thorough mastery of Ethiopic, the *Altmeister* sent forth, in 1877, a critical text with a Latin translation, and, as appendices, added the fragments of the Latin translations extant, together with critical and exegetical notes. This edition partly owes its existence to the festival of the fourth centennial of Dillmann's Alma Mater, Tuebingen.

The Ethiopic translation itself is good, and, like Henoch, and other works of similar kind, copies the tone and manner of the Ethiopic version of the Bible. It is from the Greek.

2. That the *Ascensio* was originally *two* distinct works is apparent at first glance. The real *Ascensio* begins with chap. 6, and continues to the end, and, without any doubt whatever, is a *vaticinium post eventum.* Its Christian authorship is certain. Of the first part we can, with the same certainty, say that it sprung from a Jewish source. Dillmann analyses the books as follows: 1) Chap. 2 : 1 to chap. 3 : 12 and 5 : 2–

14, are Jewish, not showing the least trace of Christian influence; 2) chap. 6 : 1, chap. 11 : 1, 23—40, the proper *Ascensio*, is the work of a Christian. That this once circulated as a separate book is probable from the fact that the old Latin translation, published by Angelus Maius, contains this part only. 3) These two parts were united by a Christian editor, who added chap. 1, (except 1, 3, 4*a*), chap. 11, 42, 43. 4) This was again revised by another Christian hand, which added chap. 3 : 13 to chap. 5 : 1, and chap. 11 : 2—22, together with chap. 1 : 3, 4*a*, chap. 5 : 15, 16, chap. 11 : 41. That the *whole* work, as such, was also extant in the western Church, is seen from the second Latin translation, found by Gieseler, where different parts of the whole work are quoted. Internal evidences point to the end of the second century after Christ as the date of this work. For further explanations consult the editions and notes of Laurence and Dillmann, especially the latter.

[II. TRANSLATION.]

THE ASCENSION OF ISAIAH, THE PROPHET.

1 And it came to pass in the twenty-sixth year of the reign of Hezekiah, king of Judah, that he called Manasseh, his son, for he was his only (son); 2 and called him into the presence of Isaiah, the son of Amos, the prophet, and into the presence Iosab, the son of Isaiah, that he might deliver to him the words of the truth (righteousness), which the king himself had seen; 3 and of the eternal judgments, and of the torments of Gehenna, which is the place of eternal punishments, and of its angels and its dominions and its powers; 4 and of the words of the faith of the Beloved-one, which he had seen in the fifteenth year of his reign in his sickness. 5 And he delivered to him the written words, which Samnas the scribe had written, and those which Isaiah, the son of Amos, had given to him and to the prophets to transcribe and deposit them with him, that which he had seen in the house of the king concerning the judgment of the angels, and the destruction of this world, and the garments of the saints, and their de-

parture and concerning their transformation, and the persecution and the ascension of the Beloved-one. 6 In the twentieth year of the reign of Hezekiah, Isaiah saw the words of this prophecy and delivered them to his son Iosab. And he (*i. e.* Hezekiah) took it, in the presence of Iosab, the son of Isaiah, 7 and Isaiah said to king Hezekiah, not in the presence of Manasseh alone: "As God liveth, whose name has not been transmitted to this world, and as liveth the Beloved-one of my Lord, and as liveth the Spirit, who speaks through me, all these commands and these words will become void in the presence of Manasseh, thy son, and by the work of his hands I shall go tormented in my body. 8 And Sammael Malkira will serve Manasseh, and fulfill his every wish, and he will be a follower of Berial rather than of me, 9 and will turn many in Jerusalem and in Judah from the faith of truth (righteousness), and Belial will dwell over him and by his hands I shall be sawn asunder. 10 And Hezekiah hearing this word, wept exceedingly, and rent his garments and threw dust upon his head and fell upon his face. 11 And Isaiah said to him: "The plan of Sammael concerning Manasseh is consummated; words profit thee nothing herein." 12 And Hezekiah thought in his heart to kill Manasseh, his son. 13 And Isaiah said to Hezekiah: "The Beloved-one has frustrated thy plan, nor will the thoughts of thy heart be fulfilled; for I am called away by this calling, and will become heir to the inheritance of the Beloved-one."

II. 1 And it came to pass, after Hezekiah had died and Manasseh was ruling, that he did not remember the commands of Hezekiah, his father, but forgot them, and Sammael dwelt over Manasseh and adhered to him. 2 And Manasseh ceased to serve the God of his father, but served Satan and his angels and his powers, 3 and changed in the house of his father those things which were before the face of Hezekiah, the words of wisdom and the service of God. 4 And Manasseh changed his heart to serve Belial; for the angel of iniquity ruling this world is Belial, whose name is Matanbukus, and he rejoiced in Jerusalem on account of Manasseh, and firmly held him in the seduction and iniquity, which was

disseminated in Jerusalem. 5 And magic, and incantation, and augury, and divination, and adultery, and persecution of saints, increased through Manasseh, and through Belkirah, and through Tobia, the Canaanite, and through John of Anathoth, and through Zalig-Newai. 6 And the rest of the words, behold, are written in the book of the kings of Judah and of Israel. 7 And Isaiah, the son of Amos, when he saw the great iniquity which was committed in Jerusalem, and the service of Satan, and the wanton conversation there, he withdrew from Jerusalem and dwelt in Bethlehem of Judea. 8 But there also there was great iniquity. And after he had withdrawn from Bethlehem, he dwelt on a mountain in a deserted place. 9 And Micah, the prophet, and Ananias, the aged, and Joel and Habbakuk, and Josab, his son, and many who believed in the ascension to heaven, the faithful, withdrew and dwelt on the mountain. 10 All were clothed in sackcloth, and all were prophets, and had nothing with them, but were naked, and all lamented exceedingly over the desertion of Israel. 11 And they ate nothing except the wild herbs which they pulled of the mountain, and cooking these, they ate together with the prophet Isaiah; and they lived on the mountains and on the hills, two years. 12 And after this, while they were in the desert, there was also a man in Samaria, whose name was Balkira, of the kindred of Saducia, the son of Chanaan, a false prophet, whose home was in Bethlehem. And Ezechias, the son of Chanaan, who was the brother of that one's father, in the days of Ahab, king of Israel, was the teacher of four hundred prophets of Baal, and smote upon the cheek and reproved Michia the prophet, the son of Amidod. 13 But he was reproved by Ahab, and Michia was cast into prison with Sadocia, the prophet, and were with Ochozia, the son of Almerem Balaav. 14 And Elijah, the Tishbite, of Gilead, reproached Ochozia and Samaria, and he prophesied concerning Ochozia, that he would die in his bed by sickness, and that Samaria would be given into the hand of Lebonasser (*i. e.* Salmanasser), because it had slain the prophets of God. 15 And when the false prophets who were with Ocho-

zia, the son of Ahab, and their teacher, Jalerias, from Mt. Joel, 16 and when Ibkira, the brother of Sadocia, heard this, they persuaded Ochozia, the king, (to trust) Aguanon and – – – Michia.

III. 1 And Balkirà perceived and saw the place of Isaiah and the prophets who were with him; for he dwelt in Bethlehem and was attached to Manasseh; and he prophesied false words in Jerusalem, and many of Jerusalem were associated with him, but *he* was of Samaria. 2 And it came to pass when Alagarzagar (Salmanassar), king of Assyria, came and took captive Samaria, and led nine parts of the people into captivity, and sent them into the provinces of the Medes and to the rivers of Tazon (Gozan), 3 but he being young escaped and came to Jerusalem, in the days of Hezekiah, the king of Judah, and did not walk in the ways of his father of Samaria, for he feared Hezekiah. 4 And he was found in the days of Hezekiah speaking words of iniquity in Jerusalem, 5 and the children of Hezekiah accused him, but he escaped to the country of Bethlehem, and gained a reputation. 6 And Balkira accused Isaiah, the prophet, and the prophets who were with him, saying: "Isaiah and they who are with him, prophesy against Jerusalem and against the cities of Judah: 'that they will be destroyed,' and Benjamin: 'that it will go into captivity,' and against thee, Oh Lord king: 'that in fetters and in iron chains thou wilt walk, 7 and they prophesy falsehoods in Israel and Judah. 8 And Isaiah himself said: 'I see more than Moses the prophet;' 9 but Moses has said: 'No man can see God, and live,' and Isaiah says: 'I have seen God, and behold, I live.' 10 Oh, king, believe that these are false prophets!' He also calls Jerusalem, Sodom, and the princes of Judah and of Jerusalem, he declares the people of Gomorrha." And in many things he accused Isaiah and the prophets before Manasseh. 11 And Berial dwelt in the heart of Manasseh, and in the heart of the princes of Judah and of Benjamin, and of the eunuchs and of the counsellors of the king. And the word of Balkira pleased him exceedingly. 12 And he sent and seized Isaiah. 13 For Berial

was in a great rage concerning Isaiah, on account of the vision and the revelation, which revealed Sammael, and because through him was seen the coming of the Beloved-one from the seventh heaven, and His transformation and His descend, and the form by which He was to be transformed into the form of a man, the persecution He was to suffer, and the torments, which the children of Israel would inflict on Him, the coming of His twelve disciples, and the instruction, and that He would be suspended on a tree before the Sabbath, and would be suspended with men, the perpetrators of iniquity, and that he would be buried in a grave, 14, and the twelve who are with him, will be offended at Him, and there will be guards guarding the grave, 15 and the descent of the angel of the Christian Church which is in heaven, who in the last days will call, and the angel, the Holy Ghost, 16 and Michael, the angel of the holy angels, and that on the third day His grave would be opened, 17 and the Beloved-one himself sitting on the shoulders of the seraphim, will go out, and will send out His twelve disciples, 18 and they will teach all nations and all tongues concerning the resurrection of the Beloved-one, and they who believe in His cross will be saved, and His assumption into the seventh heaven, from whence he will come, 19 and that many, who believe in Him will speak by the Holy Ghost, 20 and many signs and wonders will take place in those days, 21 and afterwards concerning His (second) coming, the disciples will forsake the doctrine of the twelve apostles, and their faith and charity and holiness, 22 and there will be much contention concerning His coming and approach. 23 And on that day there will be many who love office, although destitute of wisdom, 24 and there will be many wicked elders, and shepherds oppressing their sheep and then will be rapacious, even the holy shepherds. 25 And many will exchange the beautiful garments of the saints for the garment of the lover of gold, and there will be much respect of persons in those days, and lovers of the honor of this world, 26 and there will be calumny and many calumniators, and naked honor at the approach of the Lord, and the Holy Spirit will depart

from many. 27 And there will not be many prophets in those days, nor they who speak fixed (truths) except one here and there, 28 on account of the spirit of falsehood, and of fornication, and of naked honor, and of the love of gold, which will be in those who are called the servants thereof, (*i. e.* of gold) and of those who possess it. 29 And there will be in their midst great enmity, among the shepherds and elders, and between them. 30 For there will be much envy in these last days, for each one will speak of that which in his eyes causes desire, 31 and they will disregard the prophecy of the prophets who were before me, and they will disregard my visions that they may speak the ebullitions of their own heart."

IV. 1 "This, then, oh Hezekiah and Josab, my son, these are the days the world calls (?). 2 And after this is consummated, will descend Berial, the great angel, the king of this world who rules it since it stands, and will descend from the firmament in the form of a man, as king of iniquity, a matricide; he is the king of this world, 3 and the plant the twelve Apostles have planted he will pluck out; from the twelve it will be given into his hands. 4 This angel Berial, in the form of this king, will come, and there will come with him all the powers of this world, and they will hear (obey) him in everything he desires. 5 And at his word, the sun will rise at night, and he will cause the moon to appear in the sixth hour, 6 and everything that he wishes, he will do in the world; he will act and speak in the presence of the Beloved-one and will say: 'I am god, and before me there was none.' 7 And all men in the world will believe in him, 8 and will sacrifice to him, and will serve him, saying: 'He is god and beside him there is no other.' 9 And a multitude of those who have joined to receive the Beloved-one, will turn after him.' 10 And the power of his prodigies will be in every city and country, 11 and he will establish his image before him in every city, 12 and he will govern three years and six months and twenty-seven days. 13 And many believers and saints, when they see Him, for whom they hoped, but who was crucified, Jesus,

the Lord Christ, after I, Isaiah, have seen Him, who was suspended and ascended, and who believe in Him—a few from amongst them in those days will be left, His servants, fleeing from desert to desert expecting His coming. 14 But after one thousand three hundred and thirty-two days, the Lord will come with His angels, and with the hosts of the saints from the seventh heaven with the glory of the seventh heaven, and will put Berial into gehenna together with his hosts, 15 and will give rest to those whom He has found in the body in this world, to the pious; but the sun shall be ashamed, 16 and to all who, on account of the faith have execrated Berial and his kings. But the saints will walk with the Lord in His raiments, which are deposited above in the seventh heaven; and with the Lord will come whose spirits are clothed, they will descend and live in the world, and He will strengthen those, who with the saints are found in the flesh with the garments of the saints, and will minister to those who have watched in this world. 17 And after that they will be changed in their clothing of above, and their bodies will be left in the world. 18 Then the voice of the Beloved will rebuke in rage this heaven and this dry (land), and the mountains, and the hills, and the cities, and the desert, and the trees, and the angel of the sun, and the moon, and everything in which Berial has been seen, and manifested himself in this world, and there will be a resurrection and a judgment in those days in their midst, and the Beloved-one will cause fire to ascend from Himself, and it will consume all the impious, and they will be as if they had not been created. 19 But the remainder of the words of the vision are written in the vision of Babylon. 20 And the rest of the vision of the Lord, behold is written parabolically in my words written in the book which I have publicly prophesied, 21 also the descent of the Beloved-one into hell, behold, is written in the section in which the Lord says: 'Behold, my son will understand,' and all this, behold, is written in the Psalms; in the Proverbs of David, the son of Jesse, and in the Proverbs of Solomon, his son, and in the words of Kore, and Ethan, the Israelite, and in the words of Asaph, and in the rest of the

Psalms, which the angel of the spirit has dictated, 22 in those whose name is not written, and in the words of Amos, my father, and of Hosen, the prophet, and of Micah, and of Joel, and of Nahum, and of Jonah, and of Obadiah, and of Habbakuk and of Haggai, and of Sephaniah, and of Zechariah and of Malachi, and in the words of Joseph, the Just, and in the words of Daniel."

V. 1 On account of these visions, Berial was enraged at Isaiah, and dwelt in the heart of Manasseh, and sawed Isaiah asunder with a wooden saw. 2 And while Isaiah was being sawed asunder, Balkira stood accusing him, and the prophets of falsehood all stood laughing and rejoicing over Isaiah. 3 And Balkira and Mekernbekus stood before Isaiah laughing sarcastically, 4 and Beliar said to Isaiah: "Say I have lied in every thing I have said, and that the ways of Manasseh, are good and just, 5 and that the ways of Balkira are good and also of those who are with him." 6 This he said to him when they began to saw him asunder. 7 And Isaiah was in a vision of the Lord, and his eyes were open, and he saw them. 8 And Milkira said this to Isaiah: "say that which I shall say to thee, and I will turn their hearts and will compel Manasseh and the princes of Judah and the people and all Jerusalem to worship thee." 9 But Isaiah answered and said: "If it depended on me, by my word, thou wouldst be accursed, and thy hosts and all thy house, 10 for thou canst verily take nothing but the skin of my body." 11 And they seized and sawed asunder Isaiah, the son of Amos, with a wooden saw. 12 And Manasseh and Balkira and the prophets of falsehood, and the princes and the people and all stood looking. 13 But to the prophets who were with him he said before he was sawed asunder: "Go to the country of Tyre and Sidon, for me alone the Lord has mixed the cup." 14 But Isaiah, while he was being sawn, did not cry nor weep, but his mouth spoke with the Holy Spirit until he was cut into two pieces. 15 This did Berial to Isaiah through Balkira and Manasseh, for Sammael was in great anger against Isaiah from the days of Hezekiah, the king of the Jews, on account of the words he had seen

concerning the Beloved-one, 16 and concerning the destruction of Sammael, which he saw through god, while Hezekiah his father, was yet ruling. But he did it according to the will of Satan.

THE VISION WHICH ISAIAH THE SON OF AMOS SAW IN THE TWENTIETH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF HEZEKIAH, KING OF JUDAH.

VI. 1 Isaiah, the son of Amos, and Josab, the son of Isaiah, came to Hezekiah, to Jerusalem from Gilgal, 2 and he (*i. e.* Isaiah) sat down on the bed of the king; and they brought to him a throne, but he refused to sit upon it. 3 And then Isaiah commenced to speak to Hezekiah the king, concerning the faith and truth (righteousness), and all the princes of Israel, and the eunuchs, and the counselors of the king sat down. And there were forty prophets, and sons of prophets; they had come from the outskirts and from the hills and from the fields, when they heard that Isaiah had come from Gilgal to Hezekiah, 4 and they came to salute him and to hear his words, 5 and that he might put his hand over them, so that they too could prophesy, and he could hear their prophecy; and all were in the presence of Isaiah. 6 And when Isaiah spoke with Hezekiah the words of truth (righteousness) and of faith, they all heard the portal which was opened, and also the voice of the Spirit. 7 And the king called all the prophets, and all the people who were found there, and they came, but Micah and Ananias, the aged, and Joel and Josab to his right. 8 And it came to pass, when they all heard the voice of the Holy Spirit, they all worshipped on their knees, and glorified the God of truth, the Most High, Him, who is in the world above, and who dwells above, the Holy One who rests among the saints, 9 and gave glory to Him who has graciously granted an entrance to the other world, had graciously granted it to men. 10 And while speaking with the Holy Ghost, and all were listening, he became silent, and his mind was elevated above him, and he did not see the men who stood before him; 11 and his eyes were open but his mouth was silent, and his mortal mind was elevated above him, 12 but his breathing

continued in him, for he saw a vision. 13 And the angel who was sent to cause him to see (this vision) was not of this firmament, nor was he of the angels of the glory of this world, but he came from the seventh heaven. 14 But the people who stood by, except the circle of the prophets, thought that the holy Isaiah had been taken away. 15 And the vision which he saw was not of this world, but of a world concealed from the flesh. 16 And Isaiah, after he had seen this vision, told it to Hezekiah and to Josab, his son, and to the other prophets who had come. 17 But the judges and the eunuchs and the people did not hear it, except Samna, the scribe, and Ijoagem and Asaph, the scribe of the chronicles, for these two were doers of justice, and the odor of the Spirit was within them; but the people did not hear, for Micah and Josab, his son, had caused them to depart when the wisdom of this world was taken from him, as from one dead.

VII. 1 The vision, then, which Isaiah saw, he told to Hezekiah, and to Josab, his son, and to Micah, and to the other prophets, 2 and it was this: "As I prophesied as ye have heard, I saw a glorious angel, whose glory was not like that of the angels which I always see, but great was the glory and the office, so that I cannot relate the glory of this angel. 3 I saw him as he took my hand, and I said to him: 'Who art thou? And what is thy name? And whither wilt thou cause me to ascend?' For the power of conversing with him was given to me. 4 And he said to me: 'When I have caused thee to ascend the ascent, and shown thee the vision, on account of which I have been sent, then thou wilt understand who I am; but my name thou wilt not know, 5 because thou must return to thy flesh, but whither I shall cause thee to ascend thou shalt see, for to this purpose have I been sent.' 6 And I rejoiced, for he conversed mildly with me. 7 And he said to me: 'Dost those rejoice because I speak mildly with thee?' And he said: 'And Him, who magnified me, thou shalt see speaking mildly and calmly with thee; 8 and the Father of Him, who has magnified me, thou wilt see; for to this purpose was I sent from the seventh heaven, that

I should enlighten thee in all this." 9 And we ascended into the firmament, I and he, and there I saw Sammael and his hosts, and there was great slaughter therein, and words of Satan, and each one contended with the other. 10 And as it is above, it is on the earth, because a similitude of what is in the firmament is also here on the earth. 11 And I said to the angel: 'What is the contention?' 12 And he said to me: 'Thus it hath been since this world exists until now, and this slaughter (will continue) till He comes, whom you will see, and He will put an end to it.' 13 And afterwards he caused me to ascend above the firmament; for that is a heaven. 14 And there I saw a throne in the midst, and to the right and to the left thereof there were angels; 15 nor was any one like the angels who stood to the right, but they who stood to the right were exceedingly splendid, and they all glorified with *one* voice, and the throne was in the midst, and it they glorified; then also they who were to the left, after them; but their voice was not like the voice of those who were on the right, nor was their glory like the glory of those. 16 And I asked the angel who was conducting me, and said to him: 'To whom is the glorifying addressed?' 17 And he said to me: 'The glory of the seventh heaven to Him who rests in the holy world, and to His Beloved-one, from whom I am sent to thee, thither it is addressed.' 18 And again he caused me to ascend into the second heaven; but the height of this heaven was the same as from the earth to heaven and to the firmament. 19 And there, as in the first heaven, were angels to the right and left, and a throne in the midst, and the glory of angels, which was in the first heaven; and He who sat on the throne in the second heaven had greater glory than all. 20 And great glory was in the second heaven, and their glory was not like the glory of those who were in the first heaven. 21 And I fell on my face to worship him, but the angel who conducted me, did not permit me, but said to me: 'Worship not, neither the angel nor the throne of him who is of the sixth heaven, whence I am sent, before I shall have told thee in the seventh heaven.

22 For above all the heavens and their angels, thy throne and thy garments and thy crown, which thou wilt see, have been placed.' 23 And I rejoiced exceedingly, because they who loved the Most High and His Beloved-one will, at last, ascend thither through the angel of the Holy Ghost. 24 And he caused me to ascend into the third heaven, and there in like manner, I saw those to the right and to the left, and there was a throne in the midst, and he who sat thereon, but a remembrance of this world was not made there 25 And I said to the angel who was with me, for the glory of my face was changing as I ascended to each heaven: 'There is nothing of that vain world commemorated here.' 26 And he answered me saying: 'No one commemorates it on account of its irksomeness; but nothing is hidden that takes place here.' 27 And I desired to understand how it would be known, and he answered me, saying: 'When I shall have caused thee to ascend into the seventh heaven, whence I have been sent, into that which is above these, then thou wilt understand that nothing is concealed from the thrones and from those dwelling in the heavens and from the angels.' And the glory they uttered, and the glory of him sitting on the throne was great, and the angels, who were to the right and left, had greater glory than the heaven which is beneath them. 28 Again, he caused me to ascend into the fourth heaven, and the height of the third to the fourth was greater than from the earth to the firmament. 29 And there again I saw those to the right and to the left, and he sitting on the throne was in the midst, and there too they glorified. 30 And the glory and splendor of the angels to the right was greater than that to the left. 31 And again the splendor of him, who sat on the throne, exceeded that of the angels to the right, whose splendor, however, was greater than theirs who were below. 32 And he caused me to ascend into the fifth heaven. 33 And again I saw those to the right and to the left, and the glory of him who sat on the throne exceeded his who sat in the fourth heaven. 34 And the splendor of those to the right exceeded theirs to the left [from the third to the fourth (proportion)],

35 and the glory of him on the throne was greater than the angels' to the right, 36 and their glory was greater in splendor than that of the fourth heaven. 37 And I glorified Him who is not called by name, the One-Being, who dwells in the heavens, whose name is known to no mortal being, who thus transmits glory from heaven to heaven, who enlarges the glory of the angels, and increases the glory of him who sits on the throne.

VII. 1 And again he caused me to ascend into the air of the sixth heaven, and I saw a glory which I had not seen in the fifth heaven, when I ascended, 2 and angels existing in great splendor, 3 and the glory there was holy and wonderful. 4 And I said to the angel who conducted me: 'What is this that I see, my Lord?' 5 And he said: 'I am not thy Lord, but I am thy companion.' 6 And again I asked and said to him: 'Is there no association of angels?' 7 And he said: 'From the sixth heaven on; above that there is no left, and no throne placed in the midst, but it is of the power of the seventh heaven, where He lives who is not called by name, and His Chosen-one, whose name is not known, nor can all the heavens learn His name, 8 for He is the Only-one, to whose voice all the heavens and the thrones respond. Therefore I have been empowered and sent to cause thee to ascend hither, so that thou couldst see this glory, 9 and see the Lord of all these heavens and of these thrones, but who shall be transformed till He become like your image and your similitude. 11 But I say to thee, Isaiah, no mortal will return to this world, who has seen and ascended and viewed what thou hast viewed, 12 and what thou wilt see, for thou dost participate in a lot of the Lord, in the lot of the tree to come here, and thence is the virtue of the sixth heaven and of the air.' 13 And I extolled the glory of my Lord, because I had come into this lot. 14 And he said: 'Hear further from this thy associate; when from an alien body through the Angel of the Spirit thou didst ascend hither, then thou shalt receive the clothing which thou wilt behold, and other numbered, deposited clothing thou wilt see, 15 and then thou wilt be equal to the angels of the seventh heaven.' 16 And he

caused me to ascend unto the sixth heaven, and there were none to the right, and no throne in the midst, but all were of one kind and of equal glory. 17 And (permission) was given to me, and I glorified with them, and also this angel, and our glorifying was like theirs. 18 And there all called by name the First Father and His Beloved-one, Christ and the Holy Ghost, all with one voice, 19 but the voice was not like that of the angels in the fifth heaven, 20 nor like their conversation, but a different voice was here, and much light was here. 21 And then, when I was in the sixth heaven, I likened to darkness the light which I had seen in the five heavens. 22 And I rejoiced and glorified Him because He had graciously granted this light to those who await His promises. 23 And I entreated the angel who conducted me, that he should not lead me back to the world of the flesh. 24 But I tell you, Hezekiah and Josab, my son, and Micah, that great darkness is here, yes, darkness indeed great. 25 And the angel who conducted me knew what I was thinking of, and said: 'If thou dost rejoice in these lights, how much more in the seventh heaven, when thou wilt behold the lights there where the Lord is and His Beloved-one, whence I am sent, who will be called in the world 'The Son'!' 26 For not yet revealed is He who is to exist in the corruptible world, nor the garments, the thrones, the thrones preserved for the just, for those who believe in that Lord, in Him who will descend in thy image. For the light here is great and wonderful. 27 But as to thy not returning to the flesh again, thy days are not accomplished yet for thy coming here." 28 Hearing this, I grieved, but he said: 'Grieve not!' "

IX. 1 And he carried me into the air of the seventh heaven, and again I heard a voice saying: 'Whither will he ascend who dwells among strangers?' And I feared and trembled. 2 And then he said to me, as I trembled: 'Another voice coming from there says: 'Let the holy Isaiah be permitted to ascend hither, for here is his garment.' 3 And I asked the angel who was with me and said: 'Who is he that prevents, and who is he that turns himself toward me that I might ascend?' 4 And he said to me: 'He that pre-

vents, is he upon whom is the splendor of the sixth heaven, 5 and He who turns himself toward thee, is thy God, the Lord Christ, who will be called 'Jesus' in the world, but His name thou canst not hear, till thou hast ascended from thy body.' 6 Then he caused me to ascend into the seventh heaven, and I saw there a wonderful light, and angels without number. 7 And there I saw all the just, who (lived) from the time of Adam, 8 and there I saw Abel, the holy, and all the good, 9 and there I saw Henoch, and all who were with him, relieved of their mortal clothing, and I saw them in their heavenly clothing, and they were like the angels who stand there in great glory; but on their thrones they did not sit, nor were crowns of splendor on their heads. 11 And I asked the angel who was with me: 'How is it that they take these garments and are not on the thrones and with crowns?' 12 And he said to me: 'The thrones and crowns of glory they do not take now, but they do see and know what their thrones and what their crowns shall be, till the Beloved-one descends in the vision in which you have seen Him descend. 13 For He will descend into the world in the last days, as God, who will be called Christ, after He has descended and has become like our image, and is reputed flesh and man. 14 And the God of this world will be revealed through His Son, and they will lay their hands on Him, and will crucify Him on a tree, not knowing who He is. 15 And thus His descent, as thou wilt see, will be concealed from the heavens, and it will not be known who He is. 16 And after He has plundered the angel of death, He will arise on the third (day), and will live in this world five hundred and fourty-five days. 17 And then He will ascend away from the saints, many being with Him, whose spirits had not received garments till the Lord Christ ascends, and they ascend with Him. 18 Then therefore, shall they take their garments, and their thrones, and their crowns, when He himself will ascend into the seventh heaven. 19 And I said to Him what I had asked Him in the third heaven, 20 and he said to me: 'Everything in this world that has been done is known here.' 21 Then again I conversed with Him: 'Behold, one of the

angels which stand around is more splendid in glory than that angel who caused me to ascend from the world. 22 And he showed me books, but not like the books of this world, and he opened them, and in the books was writing, but not like the books of this world. And (permission) was given me, and I read them, and behold, the deeds of the children of Israel were written therein, those deeds which thon knowest, my son Josab. 23 And I said: 'In truth, there is nothing concealed in the seventh heaven, which is done in this world.' 24 And I saw there many garments deposited, and many thrones, and many crowns, 25 and I said to the angel who conducted me: 'Whose are these garments, and thrones, and crowns?' 26 And he said to me: 'These garments many in the world will receive, believing the word of Him who, as I have told thee, will be called by name, and will observe them, and will trust in His cross, for them they are deposited.' 27 And I saw a certain one standing, whose glory excelled all, and His glory was great and wonderful. 28 And after I had seen Him, all the saints I had seen, and the angels I had seen, came to Him. And Adam, and Abel, and Seth, and all the saints, first approached, and worshiped Him, and all glorified Him with one voice, and I myself glorified Him with them, and my glorifying was like theirs. 29 Then all the angels approached and worshiped and glorified. 30 And He was transformed and appeared like an angel. 31 And then the angel who conducted me said: 'Now adore,' and I adored and glorified. 32 And the angel said to me: 'This is the Lord of all the glory thou hast seen.' 33 And while I was conversing, I saw another one, glorious, and similar to Him, and the saints approached Him, and worshiped and glorified, and I glorified with them; but His glory was not transformed according to their kind. 34 And then the angels approached and worshiped. 35 And I saw the Lord and a second angel, and they were standing, 36 but the second, whom I saw, was to the left of my Lord. And I asked: 'Who is He?' And he said to me: 'Worship Him, for this is the angel of the Holy Spirit, who speaks by thee and the other saints.' 37 And I saw a great glory as the eyes of my soul were open,

and I was not able to see, as also the angel who was with me, as also all the angels whom I had seen worshiping my Lord; 38 but I saw the saints beholding His splendor with great power. 39 And then my Lord and the angel of the Spirit came to me, and said: 'See, for to thee is given (permission) to behold the Lord, and on thy account, power is given to the angel who is with thee.' 40 And I saw that my Lord worshiped, and the angel of the Holy Ghost, and that both together glorified God. 41 Then all the saints approached and worshiped. 42 And all the saints and the angels approached and worshiped, and all the angels glorified.

X. 1 And then I heard the voices and the glorifications which I had heard in the different six heavens as I ascended thither; 2 all were addressed to that glorious-one, whose glory I was not able to behold, 3 and I myself heard His glory, and I looked, 4 and the Lord and the angel of the Spirit heard all and saw all. 5 And all the glory which was addressed from the six heavens, was not only heard but was also visible. 6 And I heard the angel who conducted me saying: "This is the Highest of the high, who dwells in the sacred world and rests among the saints, who by the Spirit in the mouth of the saints will be called The Father of the Lord. 7 And I heard the words of the Most High, the Father of my Lord, saying to my Lord Christ, who will be called 'Jesus': 8 'Go and descend through all the heavens, and descend through the firmament and this world down to the angel who is in hell, but go not to Perdition (Abaddon). 9 and become like the similitude of all of those who are in the five heavens, 10 and like the form of the angels of the firmament, taking care to be assimilated also to the angels of hell. 11 But all the princes of the world will not know thee to be the Lord with me of the seven heavens and their angels, and will not know that thou art with me, 12 and when I will cry with the voice of the heavens, both to their angels and to their luminaries, and when I shall make (this cry) great to the sixth heaven, that you may judge and destroy the princes and the angels and the gods of this world, and the world which is ruled over by them, 13 because

they have denied me and said: 'We alone and none beside us!' 14 And then from the gods of death (*i. e.* dead gods) thou shalt ascend to thy place, and wilt not be transformed in each heaven, but in glory thou wilt ascend and sit at my right, 15 and then the princes and the powers of this world will worship thee.' 16 This I heard the Most glorious-one command my Lord. 17 And this I saw my Lord go from the seventh heaven into the sixth heaven. 18 And the angel, who had conducted me from this world, was with me, and said to me: 'Understand, Isaiah, and see that thou mayest behold the transformation of the Lord and His descent.' 19 And I looked: and when the angels who were in the sixth heaven saw Him, they glorified and praised Him, for He was not transformed into the species of angels who were there, and they glorified Him, and I also glorified with them. 20 And I saw, when he descended into the fifth heaven, and was assimilated to the kind of angels who are in the fifth heaven, they did not glorify Him, for his kind was like their kind. 21 And when He descended into the fourth heaven, He was assimilated to the kind of angels who were there. 22 And when they saw Him they did not glorify nor praise Him, for His kind was like their kind. 23 And again I saw as He descended into the third heaven, He was also assimilated to the kind of angels who were in the third heaven, 24 and they who guarded the gates of the heaven demanded a passport of the Lord, and He gave it to them that He might not be known; and when they saw Him, they did not glorify nor praise him, for his kind was like their kind. 25 And again I saw as He descended into the second heaven, that He gave a passport also there, for they who guarded the gates demanded it, and the Lord gave it. 26 And I saw that He was also assimilated to their kind of angels, who are in the second heaven, and when they saw Him they did not glorify Him, for His kind was like their kind. 27 And again I saw as He descended into the first heaven, and gave a passport to those who guarded the gates, and He was assimilated to the kind of angels who are to the left of the throne, but they did not glorify nor praise Him,

for His kind was like their kind. 28 But me no one questioned as to the angel who conducted me. 29 And again He descended to the firmament where the prince of this world resides, and He gave a passport to those to the left, and His kind was like theirs, and they did not glorify Him here, but each one was contentiously struggling with the other, for here was the power of evil, and contention concerning the smallest (things). 30 And I saw as He descended and was assimilated to the kind of the angels of the air, and He became like one of them. 31 And He did not give a passport because they tore and injured each other.

XI. 1 And after this I looked, and the angel who had conversed with me, who had conducted me, said to me: 'Understand, Isaiah, son of Amos, for to this purpose was I sent by God.' 2 And I looked: from the lineage of David the prophet, there was a woman, whose name was Mary, and she was a virgin, and betrothed to a man, whose name was Joseph, a carpenter, and he too was of the seed of David, the just, who is of Bethlehem in Judea, and He came to his portion. 3 And when she was betrothed she was found pregnant, and Joseph, the carpenter, desired to dismiss her. 4 But the angel of the Spirit appeared in this world, and then Joseph did not dismiss her (Mary,) but he did not reveal this to any one. 5 Neither did he approach Mary, but guarded her as a sacred virgin, although being pregnant. 6 Nor did he live with her two months, 7 and after two whole months, while Joseph was in his house, and Mary too, but both alone, 8 it then happened, as Mary was looking steadily downward with her eyes, she saw a small child, and she was stupified. 9 And after her astonishment, her womb was found as it was before she had conceived. 10 Then her husband, Joseph, said to her: 'Why are you stupified?' and his eyes were opened, and he saw the infant, and he glorified God, because the Lord had come into His portion. 11 And a voice came to them: 'Narrate this vision to no one!' 12 But the story of the infant in Bethlehem was spread abroad. 13 But some said: 'Mary has given

birth before she has been married two months,' 14 and many said: 'She has not given birth, a midwife did not go to her, and we did not hear the cries of pain.' And all were blinded in this matter, for all knew of it, but knew not whence it was. 15 And they took it (*i. e.* the infant) and went to Nazareth in Galilee. 16 And I saw Hezekiah and Josab, my son, and spoke to other prophets standing there, that it was hidden from all the heavens and all the princes, and every god of this world. 17 And I looked: in Nazareth He sucked as an infant, as is custom, that He might not be known. 18 And when He had grown up, He did great signs and wonders in the land of Israel and of Jerusalem. 19 And then the Adversary became jealous of Him, and excited the children of Israel against Him, not knowing who He was, and they brought Him to the king, and crucified Him, and He descended to the angel of hell. 20 But in Jerusalem I saw Him crucified on a tree, 21 and after three days rising and remaining (some) days. 22 And the angel who conducted me said: 'Understand, Isaiah:' and I saw Him sending twelve disciples, and ascend. 23 And I saw Him, and He was in the firmanent, but was not assimilated to their kind, and all the angels of the firmament saw Him, even Satan, and worshiped Him. 24 Great was the grief there when they said: 'How did our Lord descend over us, and we did not know the glory which was over us, which was over Him, which we saw was above Him, from the sixth heaven.' 25 And He ascended into the second heaven, but was not transformed, but all the angels who were to the right and to the left, and the throne in the midst, 26 both worshiped and glorified Him and said: 'How was our Lord concealed from us as He descended, and we did not know it?' 27 And thus He ascended into the third heaven, and thus they glorified and spoke. 28 And in the fourth and fifth heavens they said the same. 29 But the glory was one, and He was not changed from it. 30 And I saw as He ascended into the sixth heaven, they worshiped and glorified Him, 31 and in all the heavens the glorifying increased. 32 And I saw how He ascended into the seventh heaven, and

all the saints and all the angels glorified him. And then I saw Him sitting on the right hand of the Most Glorious-One, of whom I have said that I could not behold His glory. 33. And the angel of the Holy Ghost I saw sitting to the left. 34 An angel said to me: 'Isaiah, son of Amos, I preserve thee, for these things are great, for thou hast seen what no son of the flesh has seen, 35 and now return to thy garments, until thy days are completed, then thou shalt come here.' This I saw. 36 And Isaiah spoke to all who stood before him, and they glorified. And he conversed with Hezekiah, the king, and said: 'Such things have I spoken, 37 and also the consummation of this world, 38 and this whole vision will be accomplished in the last generation.' 39 And Isaiah made them swear that they would not relate this to the children of Israel, and that these words be not given to man to be perverted. 40 But *then* ye may read them. But be ye in the Holy Spirit, that ye may receive your garments and thrones and crowns of glory, deposited in the seventh heaven. 41 On account of these visions and prophecies, Sammael Satan, through Manasseh, sawed Isaiah, the son of Amos, the prophet, asunder. 42 And all this Hezekiah gave to Manasseh in the twenty-sixth year, 43 but Manasseh did not remember nor place these things in his heart, but serving Satan he was destroyed.

[Here ends (the book) of Isaiah, the prophet, with his ascension.]

III. EXPLANATORY NOTES.

Chap. I. 2 *Seen*, because it was a vision. Cf. Deut. 4 : 9. אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר־רָאוּ. Iosab, who is an important person in the *Ascensio*, is *Ἰασούβ*, יָשׁוּב, Is. 7 : 3. 3 *Ἄγγελοι, ἐξουσίαι, δυνάμεις.* 4. Beloved-one, a biblical and apocalyphal appellation of Christ. 5 *Samnas*, שֶׁבְנָא, *e. g.*, Is. 36. 3 שֶׁבְנָיָא הַסֹּפֵר, LXX. *Σομνᾶς ὁ γραμματεύς.* Cf. Is. 36 : 11, 22; 37 : 2. II. Reg. 18 : 18, 26. This v. gives, in general terms, the contents of the whole book. 7 *Not in the presence of M. alone*, *i. e.*, Iosab too was present, cf. v. 6.

As God liveth, like the Heb. חי יהוה, *e. g.* II. Sam. 12 : 5. 8 *Sammael*, סַמָּאֵל, a name of Satan, common in later Jewish theology. Cf. Buxdorf, Lex. Chal. He is the מוחא מלאך, angel of death, "a great prince in heaven," and the great "tempter" of Eve, cf. Laurence, p. 162 ff. Malkira, מַלְכִּירַע, *i. e.* king of evil, מלך and רעע. *Berial*, or Beriar, according to the well-known change of *r* and *l*. בְּלִיַּעַל (from בְּלִי *non*, *sine*, and יַעַל, *commodum*, *utilitas*, hence=*homo nequam*, *vastator*), as *Βελίαρ* in 2 Cor. 6 : 15, and in the Sibylline books and apocryphal writings, a name for Satan, Cf. Gesenius, Thesaurus I., p. 210. *Βελίαρ* is a better form than *Βελίαλ*.—The matter spoken of in v. 7—13, is discussed with reference to the name Manasseh, in a commentary on Matth. wrongly ascribed to Chrysostom: "Providentia autem Dei sic (*i. e.* ex radice נשה *oblivisci*) eum dispensavit vocari, quia *obliturus fuerat omnem conversationem patris sui sanctam*, * * *et stimulatus ab insurgente Diabolo*,—qui solet insurgere super (cf. II. 2) genus humanum ad evertendum, gesturus omnia, quae ad iracundiam provocarent." Then follows an account given here in these verses.

Chap. II. 1 *Remember*, cf נשה *oblivisci*. 4 Matanbukus found as Mekembekus in chap. 5 : 3. 5 These names have not yet been satifactorily explained. Foreign names are often distorted terribly in Ethiopic, *e. g.* "The vision of John Abu-Kalemnis," (*i. e.* *ἀποκάλυψις*). Cf. Dillmann, p. 66. 6 Imitation of biblical language. 12 *Saducias*, the same as Ezechias v. 16, cf. I. Reg. 22 : 11, 24. In the *Chronicon Pasch.* are mentioned *Ἐζεκίας καὶ Ἐλιέζερ* as *ψευδοπροφῆται;* and afterwards *Σεδεκίας καὶ Ἐλιέζερ.* 13 A corrupted passage, hence the translation is uncertain. Ochozia is *Ὀχοζίας*, אֲחַזְיָה

Chap. III. *Tazon*, *i. e.* *Γωζάν*, 2 Reg. 17 : 6, and 18 : 11, where some read *Ταγάν*.—9 cf. Ex. 33 : 20; Is. 6 : 1. Origen quotes this verse in his homily on Is. I.: "Ajunt ideo Isiam esse sectum a populo, quasi legem prævaricantem, et

extra Scripturas annunciantum. *Scriptura enim dicit; 'Nemo videbit faceam meam et vivet.' Iste vero ait: 'Vidi Dominum Sabaoth.' Moyses, aiunt, non vidit, et tu vidisti.*"—10 cf. Is. 1 : 10. 13 This verse gives even a clearer index to the whole work than chap. 1 : 4,—*before the Sabbath*, *i. e.* the day before the Sabbath, the *προσάββατον* of Mark 15 : 42.—15 cf. *οἱ ἄγγελου τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησιῶν*, Apoc. 1 : 20, and *τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησίας*, Apoc. 2 : 1.—16 *i. e.* the chief of the holy angels.—18 *His assumption* is still the object of *will teach.* 22 cf. 2 Pet. 3 : 1—10. cf. Clem. Rom. 1 : 23.—23 *office*, *i. e.* *τιμή*.—26 *Naked honor*,=*κενοδοξία*.—28 *Love of gold*, *φιλαργυρία*.

Chap. IV. 2 *A matricide*, (Nero) cf. Sibyl. Books 4, 120 seq.; 5, 142 seq.; 361 seq.—4 and ff refer to the Christian persecutions.—5 cf. 4 Ez. 5 : 4.—6 cf. 2 Thess. 2 : 4; Apoc. 13 : 5.—7 cf. Apoc. 13 : 4, 8, 12.—9 cf. 2 Thess. 2 : 3.—10 cf. 2 Thess. 2 : 9; Apoc. 13 : 14, 19 : 20; Matt. 24 : 24.—11 cf. Apoc. 13 : 14, 15, 14 : 11.—12 cf. Apoc. 13 : 5; cf. Dillmann, notes.—14 The *one thousand* is doubtful.—15 cf. Is. 24 : 23.—16 cf. later.—19 the מַשָּׂא בָּבֶל Is. 13 : 1.—LXX. *ὅρασις ἣν εἶδεν Ἡσαΐας κατὰ Βαβαλῶνος*.—22 cf. concerning Joseph Just. Nitzsch, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., Vol. II., p. 228 seq., and Ewald, Gesch. d. Volkes Israel. I., p. 602. Ed. III.

Chap V. 4—8 quoted by Ambrosius to Psalm 118.—14 cf. Tertul. de patientia 14.

Chap. VI. 6 indicates the approach of the Holy Ghost.—8 cf. Is. 57 : 15.—13 the angel comes from the highest heaven, hence directly from God, cf. Dillmann.—17 Ijoagem, cf. Is. 36 : 3, אֶלְיָקִים, *Ἐλιακίμ*. Asaph l. c. יוֹאָח בֶּן אָסָף --*Ἰωάχ ὁ τοῦ Ἀσάφ*.

Chap. VII. 14 Cf. Col. 1 : 16. 18 The *and* before *firmament* is epexegetical=*even*. This chapter presents many Gnostic ideas. 37 *θεὸς ἄρρητος*, cf. 8 : 7.

Chap. VIII. 5 Dillmann thinks this, as well as "Christ," chap. 8 : 18 and 9 : 5, 13, 17; 10 : 7, are *additamenta spuria.* 9 Cf. Henoch 62 : 15, 16; 2 Cor. 5 : 3, 4; Apoc. 3 : 4, 5—16.

545 days, *i. e.* one year and six months of 180 days. Cf. for similar opinion of some Gnostics, Irenæus Adv. Haer. I., 1:5, and 1 : 34. 22 Cf. Dan. 7 : 20; Henoch 89 : 70 seq. 90 : 14, 17, 20, 98 : 6—8; 106 : 19; 107 : 1; 108 : 7: Apoc. 20 : 12; 4 Ezr. 6 : 20.

Chap. X. 8 Hell—שְׁאוֹל, not Gehenna as in chap. I. Cf. Apoc. 9 : 11, 17 : 8. 16 *τὸν τῆς, μεγάλης δόξας.*

Chap. XI. 3 By His birth. Cf. Protevang. Jacobi 8 and 9 *καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἱερεὺς· σὺ κεκλήρωσαι τὴν παρθένον κυρίου παραλαβεῖν· παράβαλε αὐτὴν εἰς τήρησιν σεαυτῷ.* 16 Cf. Ignat. ad Eph. 19, ad Philip. 8 and 9.

ARTICLE IV.

STUDIES IN GOSPEL HARMONY.

By Rev. W. H. Settlemyer, A. M., Jefferson, Md.

The harmony of the Gospels has elicited the special attention of many for centuries, and not without gratifying results. The more they are studied, the more are the Gospels found to be reliable, not only in spirit, but in letter.

It is remarked by travelers in Syria, that in relation to customs, manners, habits, &c., they have often been surprised at the literal accuracy of the gospel narrative. Any one carefully reading the Evangelists, cannot but notice the simplicity of the style, and the straightforward manner of relating events. This circumstance leads us to expect a harmony in the various statements, and not in vain, for with but few seeming exceptions, the Gospels harmonize in a manner most remarkable. It is also observable that the more the student enters into the spirit of the Gospels, and correctly conceives such related circumstances as may attend them, together with an insight into the feelings and sympathies common to human nature in every age, the less will he find that refuses to be harmonized, even in verbal accuracy.

At present it is only proposed to make a few observations

in relation to the incidents connected with, and following after, the death and resurrection of Christ.

In the different accounts of the women to the sepulchre of Christ, the reader must have noticed the difference in the various statements of the Evangelists, and only on a very careful comparison is it manifest, how beautifully these various statements complement one another. No less remarkably do Christ's appearances to His followers, on the first day after his resurrection, unravel in harmony with facts explicitly set forth.

When by the comparison and arrangement of facts, one may be able to find their bearing upon, and relation to each other, there ought not in that case, to be any attempt to harmonize the given facts with any preconceived notion of events, but the consistency of these events should find its harmony in the chronological order of the given facts.

As these facts are the only clew by which these questions—the order in which Mary Magdalene and the other women visited the sepulchre, and saw the angels; and the order of Christ's appearance to His followers on the first day after His resurrection—may be determined, it will be found necessary to examine a few expressions relating to the points at issue.

In Matt. 28 : 1, we have it said: "*In the end of the Sabbath as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week came Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, to see the sepulchre.*"

In first referring to this passage, it is designed to show that some of the transactions, usually referred to the first natural day (from sunrise to sunset) of the week, *i. e.* after the night following the Sabbath (or seventh day) had passed, really belonged to the evening of the previous natural day. It is well known, that instead of beginning the civil day with midnight, as is our custom, the Israelites began to reckon their civil day from the evening of the natural day, or about sunset, (Lev. 23 : 32, and Luke 4 : 40). Keeping this circumstance in mind, there will be little difficulty in tracing the line of events. Luke refers, (24 : 1), to previously prepared spices, which were prepared on the preceding sixth day (Friday), and in the evening of that day, before the time of

sunset ushered in the Sabbath (23 : 54—56). This is manifest from the fact that Christ's body was removed before the day of preparation closed, and the spices were not prepared until after that event, but before the Sabbath set in. This fact serves to show the readiness and earger promptness which some of the women exhibited in reference to their ministrations to Christ. By obtaining this portraiture of their love and activity, we are aided in the comprehension of their subsequent movements. Professing obedience, however, to the law concerning the Sabbath, they rested from their works of benefaction, (v. 56) but completed their arrangements after the Sabbath, *i. e.* before the night, that followed the seventh civil day, intervened, by purchasing some sweet spices in addition to those already prepared on the evening of the sixth civil day, Mark 16 : 1. Thus far was the preparation completed before the night, preceding the first natural day of the week, intervened; "and very early in the morning, the first [natural] day of the week, they came to the sepulchre."

Their promptness and energy in laboring up to the hour of the Sabbath, and immediately after the Sabbath, in their preparations, with their known love for Christ; and also the manner of expression here used by the Evangelist, plainly indicate their anxious care for the body of Christ, that it might receive the attention which would naturally be given to one who had been greatly beloved. Already had Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, the mother of Joses and James, visited the tomb, previous to the Sabbath, and beheld where they had laid Him, (Mark 15 : 47 and Matt 27 : 56 and 61); and in their love for their Saviour, it would seem but natural that after the Sabbath, and before they reposed for the night, that they should again visit the tomb. This, according to Matthew 28 : 1, as above indicated, is the fact in the case.

We are aware that some of our best biblical exegetes seek to harmonize Matt. 28 : 1, with Mark 16 : 2, Luke 24 : 1, and John 20 : 1, but close investigation evidently shows this to be a mistake. The cause of every attempt to bring these passages into harmony seems to lie in the apparent signification

of *τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ* ("in the dawning"), for it is almost exclusively referred, by exegetes, to the morning or dawn of the natural day, (about 6 A. M.) instead of the dawn or beginning of the civil day, (about 6 P. M.)

That this event refers to the dawn of the civil day, is shown in Luke 23 : 54, where, at, or immediately after the burial of Christ, we are told that the Sabbath was drawing on (*ἐπέφωσκε,* "was dawning"). Here the application of *ἐπίφωσκειν* to the *dawning of the civil day* is unequivocally fixed by parallel passages, in Matt. 27 : 57, and Mark 15 : 42. In the former, the time of the burial of the body of Jesus is designated by *Ὀψίας δε γενομένης* "when the even was come." The latter passage marks the time still more definitely. *Καὶ ἤδη ὀψίας γενομένης (ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευή, ὅ ἐστι προσάββατον.)* "And now when the even was come, (because it was preparation, that is the day before the Sabbath)." This occasion of Joseph's claiming the body of Christ for burial, ere the hour of sunset, (compare Luke 4 : 40) should usher in the *dawning* or beginning of the civil sabbath day, gives us, without any doubt, the signification of *επιφωσκεὶν*, as used in Luke 23 : 54. And this word, used in the same connection of events, even the marking of the approach of the same hour, the dawning of the Sabbath, is most appropriately applied in the same sense to Matt. 28 : 1; and in fact cannot by any law of exegesis be referred to any other time than that fixed by the exegesis of Luke 23 : 54, unless such sense be excluded by some controlling circumstance. In the instances cited there is a clear and near proximity of time between *ὀψε* or *ὀψιας* and *επιφωσκεὶν*. The first pointing to the last hour, or more properly to the close of the civil day; and the last to the immediate entrance of the following civil day. If, then, in the detailed account of this same event, the same words are used, not separately as above, but in connection, can there be any doubt as to their signification? *Ὀψε δὲ σαββάτων, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰσ μίαν σαββάτων,* "late in the Sabbath (*i. e.* after or at the end of the Sabbath) in the dawning unto the first of the week," from the use of

ὀψε and ἐπιφωσκεὶν above, has a double reference to the *dawn of the civil day*, and cannot well be otherwise understood. Moreover, Matthew proceeds to mention the earthquake, the descent of the angel, his rolling away the stone, and sitting on it, and the terror of the watch, *after* the visit of the women to the sepulchre, which also implies that his account of the visit (28 : 1) refers to the dawn of the *civil day*, and in the evening of the natural day before the resurrection.

Mark also refers to these two Marys when the Sabbath was past, as actively engaged in preparing for work on the coming morning (16 : 1); but none of the evangelists use επιφωσκεῖν to describe the opening of the natural day, in fact, if we mistake not, it is used in the N. T. in no other sense than to describe the inauguration of the civil day, and only in this connection.

As further evidence, on this point, we quote the following definition entire of επιφωσκὼ from Pickering's Classical Greek Lexicon: "To shine forth, to appear; to dawn, Matt. 28 : 1; *the Jews reckoned their days from sunset; and, in Syriac, the word corresponding to* ἐπιφωσκειν *is also applied to the evening preceding any day.—Gesenius in Class. Journ., xxvii., 160.*"

This interpretation of this passage is neither unnatural nor constrained in any sense, nor is it out of harmony with any stated occurrence, but in perfect accordance with the tenor of events, and the given use of terms here employed.

This leaves us but three accounts concerning the visits of the women to the sepulchre to harmonize. In doing this, it will avail us to note particularly the expressions of the evangelists concerning the morning visits, to observe whether they readily agree.

In reviewing these accounts, it is but just to take a natural and fair signification from plain and easy statements, and a naturally applied sense from words not so definite. In John 20 : 1, we learn that Mary Magdalene visited the tomb while it was yet dark, (σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης), while Mark says (16 : 2), "they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun." Literally, "the sun having arisen," or *after* sunrise, rather than *at* sunrise (ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου). Here we have two ex-

press and definite statements, that ought not to be attempted to be harmonized, unless other facts equally definite bring in a statement directly antagonistic, *i. e.* a statement *requiring* the given expressions to be harmonized. This requisition cannot be made unless any one of the evangelists, or other equally reliable historian, expressly states that all the women *went together* to the sepulchre in the morning. But this is nowhere done, for neither Mark nor Luke asserts that Mary Magdalene was with the other women when they visited the sepulchre in the morning. There have been attempts to show that Mark's "after sunrise" was modified by the accompanying *λιαν πρωϊ* ("very early"); but this expressions has no definite signification, as is evident from Mark's own use of it. For whenever he would speak definitely, he limits the *λιαν πρωι* by some other word or phrase. Here he distinctly states that *λιαν πρωϊ* has reference to the time after sunrise. In chap. 1, v. 35, he just as distinctly states that it has reference to the time of night. *Καὶ πρωϊ ἔννυχος λίαν;* "And in the morning, rising up a great while *before day*, he went out, * * and there prayed." Then it is plain, that *λιαν πρωι* (very early) should not be regarded as the *specific* phrase, but as a *generic*, and subject to modification. In this case, by Mark's own use of it, it becomes, instead of the adjunct, the principal chronological phrase, and is itself modified by the adjunct phrase *ἀνατεὶλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου*, "the sun having arisen." The position of the Greek phrase (*ανατείλαντος*, &c.), holds also a subordinate place in the sentence to the *λιαν*, &c., which gives the same evidence as the author's varied use of the Greek phrases above cited. Then if John's "while it was yet *dark*" will not agree with Mark's "the sun *having arisen*," or, as the English version has it, "at the rising of the sun," Mary Magdalene must have gone alone while it was yet dark, and the others must have delayed until after sunrise, in their morning visit to the sepulchre.

Why should we not expect this, for Mary Magdalene was doubtless the same who had the most forgiven, and consequently loved the most? No doubt Mary Magdalene expect-

ed to be back again to help embalm, but owing to the resurrection, as we shall hereafter see, was by circumstances still kept apart from the others. There is no reason why we should not consider the visit of Mary Magdalene to the tomb, as occurring earlier in the morning of the natural day than the visit of the other women. The succeeding events, to which reference will be had hereafter, evidence the same. What place, therefore, does Luke's *ὄρθρου βαθεός* obtain in the chronological order of events? Can this expression be made to correspond with either of the other accounts, or does it also mark a definite time of its own; or in general correspond with all the others?

A few classical definitions, with others, will aid us just here. *Ορθρος βαθυς,* say Liddell and Scott, signifies the first dawn. *βαθυς* is defined the "morning-prime." *Ὀρθος,* they add in an etymological note, is from *ορνυμὶ*, Latin, *orior; ορθος, "the rising of the sun."*

Pickering gives substantially the first definition above. Robinson says, it is the time before and about daybreak, while one still needs a light; but later, also, including the morning twilight until near sunrise.

Schleusner says: Ter tantum legitur in N. T. Luc 24 : 1; *ὄρθρου βαθέος,* scilicet *ὄντος*, primo mane. "Only thrice is it [*ορθρος*] to be found in the N. T. Luke 24 : 1, [the other two being Jno. 8 : 2, and Acts 5 : 21]; "*ορθρου βαθέος,* supply *ὄντος,* [being] early in the morning."

This phrase then seems, at least as Robinson defines it, to agree with the statement of John, while Liddell and Scott's definition makes the time very nearly coincide with Mark's time of sunrise.

The general idea of the time included in the above phrase, however, seems to correspond quite well with *λίαν πρωΐ*, and may signify any time included in the phrase "*very early;*" ranging, in all probability, between the definite expressions of John and Mark. Doubtless Luke had the early visit of Mary Magdalene in his mind, when he wrote, as he afterward included her with the rest, but, evidently, without again referring to the time, he includes the later visit of the others

in a general statement. This is inferred from the manner in which he mingles circumstances, which, when considered chronologically, are distinctly stated by the others. Instancing the general manner in which he groups the distinctly stated facts of the other Gospels, especially their telling "all these things to *the eleven, and to all the rest*," as if all the disciples had been together, and had received the intelligence at the same time. The circumstance of Peter alone going to the sepulchre, in Luke's account, *after* the women had "told all these thing to the eleven and to all the rest," and also that Peter went from among the company of "the eleven and all the rest,"—when all other accounts record what would be naturally expected, that all the disciples that heard, in the early part of the day, of Christ's resurrection, and before they saw him, hastened to the tomb—moreover impresses one with the idea that Luke spoke in general terms. Even Mary Magdalene is represented by Luke as being with the rest, when she went to the tomb in the morning of the *natural* day, which seems inconsistent with the facts stated, for she is represented as seeing the Lord *at* the sepulchre, the others *on the way* home, she saw him *first*, therefore must have been alone, &c. The only natural explanation appertaining to Luke's gospel, is to regard him as hastily passing over such statements as the others had given more fully and chronologically. In consistency with the fact that he passed rapidly over items of occurrences noticed more definitely by the other gospels, (for the Spirit, Jno. 14 : 26, in bringing all things to *their* remembrance, not to *each one's* remembrance, accorded to Luke this part of the narrative), he gives us the only full account of the interview between Christ and the two disciples on the way to Emmaus. In consequence of this interview, we obtain an additional reason for believing that Mary Magdalene went while it was yet dark, apart from the others, and the others after sunrise, to the sepulchre.

The two who went on the same day to Emmaus report, that "certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre, and when they found not

his body, they came saying that they had also seen a vision of angels, who said that he was alive," (Luke 24 : 22, 23).

It is presumable that in every case where there is a direct testimony that Christ had been seen, it is so reported as a positive confirmation of his resurrection (Jno. 20 : 18). In fact the women were charged to report at once, to the disciples, the testimony of the angels concerning the resurrection. This report of the angels is doubtless all the testimony they had to give, for, had they seen Jesus, like Mary Magdalene, they would have so testified; the inference, therefore, is, that they had not seen him—from which it is plain that Mary Magdalene was not with the rest, as she saw both Christ and the angels at the same time.

Again, they report that they found not the body, a report utterly inconceivable had they seen Christ. Mary saw Christ at the tomb, the others on the way home, from which it is quite apparent that Mary was both separate from the rest, and *first* saw the Lord.

After the "other women" told some of the disciples, they (other disciples probably than Peter and John) also went to the tomb (v. 24), and found it as the women had said, but because they saw Him not, they doubted of the truth of the statement (v. 25), and could not satisfy themselves with what they had heard and seen. If then they found it as the women had said, they *had not said* that they had seen Christ, for from their doubts it is sure the disciples had not seen him. Taking in consideration also how ready these same men were to testify directly of Christ's resurrection, and with what haste they returned to Jerusalem to tell of the things by the way, and how he had made himself known to them; we have, *prima facie* evidence that the women, who informed Cleopas and his companion of Christ's resurrection, had not as yet seen Christ.—Therefore Christ must have met the women in the way after they had informed Cleopas and his companion, and may be others, that they had seen the vision of angels.

From these data it is easy to trace the order of the women's visits to the sepulchre.

1. Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, and perhaps some others, were present (Friday evening before 6 P. M.) when Christ's body was laid in the tomb. Mark 15 : 47; Luke 23 : 55, &c.

2. Mary Magdalene and the other Mary visited the tomb soon as the civil Sabbath was ended, (Saturday evening after 6 P. M.) Matt 28 : 1. This visit was made after *they rested on the Sabbath*, Luke 23 : 56.

3. Mary Magdalene visited the tomb before daylight of the next natural day (Lord's day or Sunday), as it is distinctly stated by John (20 : 1). Then she ran and told Peter and John who went to the tomb, saw only the clothes, and returned. Mary doubtless followed them back to the tomb, and after Peter and John left, stood without weeping, then stooped down to look into the sepulchre, and saw two angels, and immediately after saw Jesus *at the sepulchre*, and was the only one to see him there, as well as the *first one*. Then she returned and informed the disciples she had seen the Lord.

4. After sunrise, the other women visited the tomb to complete the embalming of Christ's body, as related by Mark (16 : 2). But they found a young man (angel, Matt. 28 : 5; two men, Luke 24 : 4,) in the sepulchre, who declared that Jesus was not *there*, but "goeth into Galilee;" and, fearing, they fled, "neither said they anything to any" one of their own company, *i. e.* they did not comment among themselves on the way concerning the things told them by the angel, or angels, but "they departed quickly from the sepulchre with fear and great joy; and did run to bring his disciples word." Matt. 28 : 8; Luke 24 : 9. To supply "*man*" in Mark 16 : 8, is not necessary to complete the sense of the sentence, but is contradicted in Matt. and Luke, as quoted above. And it is quite in conformity with the tenor of events, to presume that as they ran in haste and great joy, even with trembling and amazement, that they did not say anything to each other as they *ran* to declare the tidings to the disciples.

By the way they met some disciples, Cleopas and his companion, and perhaps others: then they met Jesus, who re-

peated to them their commission to go and tell the disciples to meet him in Galilee.

It next remains to be seen, in what order Christ appeared to His disciples on the first day of the week. Mark says positively (16 : 9), that Jesus appeared first to Mary Magdalene; nor is there any difficulty, as some (Robinson's Greek Harmony, p. 232) allege, in assuming this literal statement. In following the order of time that the facts already investigated have given, and the hints or allusions given by the various incidents recorded, there can be no difficulty as to Mary's having first seen the Lord.

She, after the evening visit in company with the other Mary, went out alone in the morning before dawn, and finding to her surprise that her Lord was gone from the sepulchre, she ran to tell Peter and John of the circumstance.

The expression *οἴδαμεν* "We know," (used in the plural as though the women of that company were together,) which is found in this connection, presents no difficulty in its application to Mary alone, for it falls in with the current mode of expression (*usus loquendi*) both of that day, (see John 3 : 2) and of the present day. Then Peter and John went to the sepulchre, and into it; but saw neither the angels nor the Lord, after which they also returned home. Mary Magdalene evidently returned to the sepulchre with them, or immediately after them, as they ran with celerity, and not knowing what next to do, "stood without the sepulchre weeping, and as she stooped down and looked into the sepulchre she saw two angels in white." And as they spake to her, she again lamented the absence of her Lord's body, (lamenting before to Peter and John), but on turning, probably having heard the approach of some one, she saw her Lord, whom she on first sight mistook for the gardner. Thus she saw the Lord and the angels at the same time and place. Besides the general impression that Mary Magdalene was alone at the tomb, as it may also be inferred from John (20 : 1), we have the account of the two who went to Emmaus, giving us important intimations here also. As already seen and for reasons given above, the other women,

after they left the tomb, met the disciples, before Jesus appeared to them. It would seem unnatural, however possible it might be, that Christ should first go away from the tomb to appear to the other women, and afterward return to appear to Mary—but much more probable, that when He left it He returned not again. Then, as Christ must have met the other women some distance from the tomb; for they, from the tenor of their conversation with the disciples, Cleopas and others, had seen the angels, and informed these disciples previous to having met their risen Lord; it is only natural to conclude, as He appeared to Mary at the tomb, that, in accordance with Mark, He appeared to her first. This conclusion is strengthened from the events recorded. Mary went out before daylight, and had ample time to go to the tomb, which was hard by the city (afterward in the city), and, seeing that the body was gone, to run and tell Peter and John; to return with them, and after they were gone, to look again in the sepulchre, to more fully assure herself that the body was not there, and instead of the body, see the angels, and Jesus, and to depart to tell the rest as Christ bade her, before the other women appeared, or even left their home; which occurred after sunrise. When the other women came they saw the angels only, for Christ was gone (Mark 16 : 6). They were also told by the angels to go and tell the disciples. After they left the tomb as directed by the angels, they saw the two, Cleopas and his companion, and perhaps others; then they met Christ on the way. In all probability, having before sent special word to him (Mark 16 : 7) he next appeared to Peter, because we are told that *the day was far spent* when "he appeared in another form," to the two on the way to Emmaus; and a report was among the disciples that the Lord had appeared to Simon when the two returned. Then as the two were speaking of Christ, and were relating the wonderful things they had heard and seen, Christ again appears in their midst. This makes up the sum of his recorded manifestations for that day.

We cannot do otherwise than record our admiration for

the natural beauty and expression displayed in the narration of these events; and how perfectly they shadow forth the more delicate tints of real life. The most fitting conclusion that we can add to the complementary character of the Gospels, evinced in this fragmentary study of Christ's life, is an extract from the pen of the late Dr. Jas. Hamilton:

"The more delicate these coincidences are, the surer is the inference from them. If you were comparing a check with a check-book from which it was said to be taken, and found not only the cut portion to correspond with the counterfoil, but if on microscopic examination the torn corner finely coincided—if you found its rough and ragged edge and each riven portion to match exactly the surface from which it was said to be sundered, you could no longer doubt that the piece of paper in your hand had been taken from that book. And these delicate agreements of one Evangelist with the other show that their story is an extract from the book of truth, a leaf from the volume of actual occurrence, a derivation from a counterpart original."

ARTICLE V.

"THE POWER OF DARKNESS."

By Rev. H. L. Dox, Tremont, Pa.

"But this is your hour and the power of darkness."
"Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness."

Power is "mental or moral ability to act;" to induce, concentrate, or control action; to so exercise, or regulate force as to secure results.

Darkness is the absence of light. The *power of darkness* is its tendency to occasion evil, or to obstruct good. As it occurs in the passages of Scripture given above, the expression means *the combined influence of Evil Spirits arrayed against the economy of grace.*

Of this class of beings the Holy Scriptures are the only reliable source of information. The mythological ideas, more

or less prevalent, it is more than probable, were originally derived from the sacred writings of the Hebrews.

In the study of this subject, accordingly, it is not worth while to give any attention to the endlessly diversified superstitions of the ancients. The river at its mouth, impregnated with foreign substances held in solution, proves nothing respecting its waters at the fountain head.

It is a common practice, in the investigation of the more obscure doctrines of Revelation, to give great prominence to arguments of a philological character. Terms are traced to their origin with a view to their etymological significance. In these processes it doubtless some times happens that the classics interpret the Scriptures. Such researches *may* be worse than useless. Very little attention to the laws of language will satisfy any one, that words cannot be carried through all their transitional liabilities with precision enough to make *definitions* the foundation of religious faith. The student, at last, is usually left to make his choice between conflicting lexicographers and exegetes.

In studying the subject now before us, may we hopefully invoke the wisdom of the Fathers? Will a pilgrimage through the vast and not very clearly defined field of research thus indicated, promise compensation? Chasms will be found which can only be bridged by conjecture. In endeavoring to fix upon the polar point we may find ourselves in an open sea. About ancestorial opinions how many doubtful disputations!

Upon what foundation, then, does the belief in the existence and personality of beings, holding intermediate rank between God and man, rest?

Not surely, upon the testimony of the senses. Whether or not it be admitted that devils are sometimes objects of such cognition, the claim of personality must rest on other proof. Nor is this point reached by the consciousness that evil influences are brought to bear upon us. This may be corroborative and explanatory, but in itself is not conclusive. The question, whether the grand chain of agencies in the Divine economy is complete, without some intervening link

between God and man, is germane: but the answer, be it what it may, will not cover the case. Their is no authority for the assumption that any order of angelic beings are supplemental to either God or man. The distance between them should not indeed be overlooked. But upon speculation in regard to it, we cannot make much dependence. It is too vague. And the same thing may be said respecting the general belief on this subject. That it is of great antiquity and well nigh approximates universality, there can be no doubt. But, as already intimated, this belief, most likely, originated in the earliest revelations made to man, and has been traditionally propagated, from generation to generation and from one nation to another. In fact, fruitful sources of suggestion upon many other subjeets are unavailable respecting this. Reason is mainly silent until conclusions have been arrived at from the "law and the testimony." Hence we appeal to this infallible touch stone of truth.

From Genesis to Revelation we find frequent, and often very emphatic, allusions to Evil Spirits. And the first question which claims attention is, Do they denote *personalities*, or *personifications?* Do the names DEVIL, SATAN, BEELZEBUB, and others of like import, indicate beings or qualities? Does the Devil exist independently of all other beings, as does man? Or are the attributes of distinctive entities ascribed to him and his evil associates as figures of speech?

An exhaustive view of this single inquiry would of itself require the space allotted to the entire article. And it is not probable that even such a view would dissipate the doubts of the skeptical. The truth is, that all, or nearly all, who deny the personality of evil spirits, deny also the Bible as an authoritative revelation. Hence, to offer Bible proof to those who reject the Bible, would be equivalent to casting pearls before swine. But to answer the objections which infidels urge against the Christian system, is not the main object of Scriptural researches and doctrinal discussions. The faith of the believer needs development and expansion. Accordingly, a brief statement of the proof by which the personality of Satan is established may not here be out of place.

It is just as easy to prove the personality of Satan as it is to prove the personality of Pontius Pilate. And the argument is equally conclusive. Without indulging in the licentious logic of modern skeptics, a logic which annihilates the very idea of subjective existence, it is no more possible to set aside the personality of Satan, than it is to set aside the personality of Adam and Eve. The fall of our first parents, as set forth in the Mosaic narrative, furnishes overwhelming testimony that the tempter was as much a person as was either of the tempted. But our purpose will be better subserved by directing attention to the teachings of the New Testament, with which all classes are presumed to be more familiar.

The manner in which Christ and the Apostles spake on this subject, should be carefully considered. Their utterances were subjected to the severest scrutiny, and it is not, accordingly, presumable that under divine guidance they overlooked any liabilities to misconstruction or misrepresentation.

With the exception of the Sadducees, all the different sects of the Jews believed in the doctrine of angels and spirits. And it is quite evident that by angel and spirit, they understood spiritual beings. Now all the teachers and writers of the New Testament fully understood the prevalent belief on this subject. And yet they made no issue with it. They endorsed it without qualification. Nay, more; they taught it as understood by the people. And the passages which justify this statement are too numerous, too familiar, too unmistakable in their meaning, to render either quotation or exposition at all necessary. Accordingly, there is but a single alternative. Either Christ and the Apostles practiced the most inexcusable prevarication, or the doctrine of the personality of Satan, as believed by the Jews, is true. And with the Christian this settles the question. Christ and the Apostles are no more liable to the charge of conniving at error, than they are of teaching it.

Again: the New Testament clearly recognizes in the great spiritual adversary, all the essential characteristics of person-

ality. Only three of these characteristics need to be noticed; *perception*, *judgment*, *volition*. If it is found that these constitutional elements of personality belong to him, from the conclusion claimed there is no escape. Out of the many passages which might be cited, only a few will be examined.

The first to which we call attention is Matt. 4 : 9. Another is 2 Tim. 2 : 26. A third is 1 Pet. 5 : 8. To economize space, we make the references without the quotations. The reader is desired to turn to them.

Now, whatever else these texts do or do not teach, they do teach that the Devil possessed and exercised *perception*, *judgment*, *volition*. There was clearly an apprehension of an *end* sought to be secured. As clearly there was judgment in the selection of the *means* to be used in securing that end. And not less clearly was there a *determinative volition* to use those means with a view to that end. The *end* was to obtain personal supremacy over those upon whom the power of the Devil was brought to bear. The *means* were the presentation of such motives, and the exercise of such power, as were practicable to secure such supremacy. And with equal distinctness do these texts set forth the fact that *character*, *condition*, *time*, *circumstances*, were intelligently taken into the account, with a view to the success in the efforts made. More still. They show that these personal powers were exercised independently of, and in direct opposition to, other personalities. There was not only a separate, but an antagonistic exercise of perception, judgment, volition. Were these constitutional elements of personality more clearly exemplified in the trial of Jesus by Pontius Pilate?

As establishing the same point, one more argument will be submitted. It is founded upon the relation which the Devil sustains to the Divine government. Respecting this relation, three things are unquestionable. One is, he is in a state of rebellion. Another is, he is in a state of punitive restriction. By this is meant, that, though he is not in such a condition of punishment as to prevent rebellious activity, he is subject to restraint in the execution of his insurrectionary purposes. The third is, within his allowed limits, he maintains a gov-

ernment of his own, in opposition to the government of God. If further proof is needed upon points made apparent in nearly every text relating to satanic agency, it will be found quite largely when another part of the subject is reached. What is here to be insisted upon, is the fact that his recognition as a subject of government proves his personality. His accountability, his capability of transgressing law, of persistent and organized rebellion, and of punishment, must sweep away all rational doubt.

And it is only necessary to add, that the same arguments are equally conclusive as applied to evil spirits generally. Accordingly, if what has been said has any force, the doctrine of personality must be accepted alike with regard to the "Devil and his angels."

If now the question proposed to Satan, as found in the first chapter of Job—"Whence comest thou"—should be raised respecting his origin, the answer furnished by some of our standard writers would be, that little or nothing can be known about it. Is this answer less mysterious than the subject to which it relates? Why assume such inevitable ignorance with an open Bible in our hands? True, the account of the origin of evil spirits is not as specific as is the account of the creation of man. Nor is it needful it should be. Some of our conclusions do rest upon *inferences.* But what of that? If legitimately drawn from well established data, are inferences not reliable? Exclude them altogether, and the creed of Christendom will be a very narrow one. Why suspicious of inferences? Are there any inherent difficulties involved suggestive of doubt? Are we more likely to draw unwarrantable conclusions from facts and first principles, than we are to misapprehend the meaning of the most positive statements? As commonly stated, upon what does the doctrine of a First Cause depend? Design is everywhere apparent, and we *infer* from it that there must have been a Designer. May not the same method of reasoning be applied to the origin of demons, especially if the premises are furnished by the Sacred Scriptures?

Accepting the fact of such spiritual entities, some things

at least respecting them are certain. One is, they are *created* beings; they are not *self-existent.* By common consent, self-existence can be predicated only of God.

Another proposition is, that in the ultimate sense, God is the only creative power in the universe. "Without Him was not any thing made that was made." Is it not, hence, just as certain that God created evil angels as it is that He created man? The creative domain is not limited by secondary causes. The last child that shall be born of Adam's race will be as truly a creature of God as was the great progenitor himself. Nor do the Scriptures permit us to suppose that any other intelligences derived their being from any other source.

Another proposition is, that as they came from His hand, like all His works, they were "very good." The effect must bear the impress of the cause. In the nature of things, it is no more possible for a Holy God to call into existence a race of rebellious beings, than it is to bring a "clean thing out of an unclean."

The conclusion accordingly must be, that the "Devil and his angels" are fallen beings. They were created upright, but, as moral beings, they apostatized by the abuse of their own powers. The *possibility* of such a result, is fully sustained by the nature of things. Only those are free who by their own choice may make themselves slaves. That such a possibility *may become* a sad reality, is more than exemplified by the sorrowful experience of the human race. As *to the fact*, the language of Scripture is unmistakable. Christ declares that the Devil "abode not in the truth," implying alike that he was created in it, and that he fell from it. And the record of Jude is equally clear and impressive. He speaks of "angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation." Such language can mean nothing but apostacy from an original state of rectitude.

Now, there are several questions of curious interest which precisely at this point are likely to press upon one's attention? At what date in the distant past, and for what reasons, were these evil spirits moved to "foul revolt?" Was it

simultaneous, or have there been rebellious uprisings at different epochs? Respecting all such inquiries, no satisfactory replies can be furnished. Nor are they needed. There must be a limit to our understanding, and in infinite wisdom God has placed the means of instruction within our reach, not so much for our gratification as for our good. In reality, we are not to be concerned about evil spirits, only as by their relations to us, we are liable to be injured by them. The knowledge we need is of a defensive character, and with a view to our entire safety, we may be thoroughly fitted and furnished from the Divine armory.

All that may be practical or profitable within the broad scope of the foregoing, and other like interrogatories, can perhaps be covered by a few general statements, such as the following:

There is no foundation for even conjecture respecting dates in the pre-Adamic period, during which the creation and apostacy of evil spirits must have occurred. We do know, and so much is all we should care to know, that Satan existed as a fallen being before the creation of man, and that it was by his agency that our first parents were led into disobedience.

The doctrine of a *plurality* of devils has an early recognition in the sacred records, and the allusions to it in the New Testament are so frequent and so emphatic as to leave no doubt that Christ and the Apostles intended to teach this doctrine. But there does not seem to be the slightest intimation of any classification with a view to anteriority.

For the supposition that different classes sustain different relations and cherish different dispositions with regard to the human race, there seems to be no foundation. All evil spirits are represented as relentless enemies, and are in no measure susceptible of virtuous restraints. Nor is there any warrant for the assumption, that the condition of any portion of them is such as to afford the slightest indemnity against their evil designs. The passage which speaks of some as held in "chains," does not necessarily imply absolute prohibi-

tion from evil. Practically and certainly, so far as mankind are concerned, it can mean nothing more than that those spoken of, like all others, are more or less under restraint.

By unquestionable implication, the Bible teaches that, as a whole, they are in a state of hopeless abandonment. They are beyond redemption. So far as we can see, no transforming or elevating means are in operation with regard to them. Nay, it is more than possible that the most effective reformatory influences, if used, would utterly fail to reach them. Whether they were at once consigned to this irremediable state as a consequence of their first disobedience, cannot be determined. Perhaps there is nothing in the word of God, nothing in the nature of things, to preclude the hypothesis that they may have incorrigibly passed through a period of probation, though, evidently, they are not in a state of probation. Perhaps all that can or should be said here is, that their doom has been fixed by Him who makes no mistakes. "The Judge of all the earth will do right." Excepting the probationary aspect, their present state is not dissimilar to that of impenitent human beings. It intermediates condemnation and execution. The sentence has been passed upon them, but for reasons which may wholly relate to others, it is held in suspension.

And here, perhaps more appropriately than elsewhere, we may meet the much mooted question respecting the *possible apostacy of holy beings.* It is true this dark problem is not peculiar to demonology. More effort has been expended to explain the origin of evil, as it affects the human race, than has been devoted to any other topic within the scope of theological research; and perhaps with less desirable results. And yet it cannot well be entirely ignored. The line between what may be known and the unknowable, should be, so far as it can be, drawn and recognized. The fall of angels and the fall of man are distinct, yet similar. Both were created upright. Both were moral beings. Both were moved by motives to violate law. Both, as a consequence, lost their rectitude, fell under condemnation, and underwent an appalling change in their nature and constitution. The known

point of dissimilarity is, that man was moved to disobedience by the presence and persuasion of a being already fallen. And this, doubtless, in his case is the key to the mystery. It is possible to conceive how even a holy being, wholly unguarded by experience, and free from all suspicions of danger, may be so assailed as to yield to temptation. For this, and for other reasons, this difficult subject may be more advantageously contemplated from the human than from the angelic standpoint. Whether or not the conquest of the human mind by the tempter, can be explained upon psychological principles, the relevancy of certain facts, as bearing upon the inquiry, will not be disputed. Man's nature, functionally, was sadly deranged by the fall; constitutionally, no fundamental changes were produced in it. In kind and number, his powers and passions remained as they were originally, though in their relative strength and operations they have become very otherwise. And yet, damaging as is the contrast, we have no better means for judging of the workings of an unfallen mind under the influence of temptation, than the careful cognizance of our own under circumstances more or less similar. But the gulf between the human and the angelic cannot thus be spanned. Nor are the teachings of the Scriptures as largely available in the one case as in the other. Hence, if the liabilities of original rectitude are to be explored, man's apostacy is doubtless the true starting point. But no such venture is now to be made.

Why, then, it may be asked, has the subject been broached? What has been or can be gained, if all that has been claimed is conceded? Just this, and nothing more: that the fall of man and the fall of angels must be accepted or rejected for reasons essentially the same. They must stand or fall together. There is not the difference of truth and falsehood between them. Admit what is common to both, and the peculiarities of either are capable of explanation.

It has already been seen that man was led into sin by the temptation of the Devil. It cannot be claimed that the fall of angels was occasioned by any such agency. If we suppose—and we have no authority for any such supposition—that

some apostate of longer standing, was the tempter in that case, the real difficulty is only carried further back, it is neither removed nor lessened. The difficulty is to understand how a holy being can be affected by sin so as to become sinful. This question occurs in the case of man. And if we answer it by pointing to the tempter, and, by supposition, in the same way, as we meet it again in the case of angels, we shall find occasion for an endless series of suppositions, which will bring us no nearer an explanation than we were when we started. Let us then at once concede that angels were not tempted by any previously fallen beings, as our first parents were. We are then prepared to inquire immediately, whether in the case of angels there was any fact which is as explanatory of their fall, as is the fact of the tempter explanatory of the fall of man. If there is such a fact, it must be sought in what is peculiar in their nature, or in their condition, or in both.

It has already been said that angels, like men, are *moral* beings. But it should be remembered that all moral beings are not essentially constituted alike. Angels are not men. And the difference between them as to their nature, *may* as clearly explain the apostacy of angels, as the fact of the tempter explains the apostacy of man. The case stands thus: they fell; they were not beguiled by any previously fallen being; accordingly, the motive must have originated within themselves. Man was moved from without. Angels must have been moved from within, as there was nothing without to move them. And could we as clearly apprehend wherein angels differ from men, as we apprehend the fact that Adam and Eve were tempted by the Devil, that difference might be as satisfactory in the one case as is the admitted fact in the other. It is true, we do *not* so clearly apprehend the distinctive characteristics of angels, as we do the fact that there was an evil being who tempted man. And yet that there is a difference between angels and men, is just as certainly a fact.

The point to be reached by the argument, let it be borne in mind, is *not* whether there ever was an apostacy of angels; but whether, accepting such apostacy, it is more diffi-

cult to harmonize it with reason, than is the doctrine of human apostacy. Nor is it claimed that the tempter in the one case, nor the dissimilarity of nature in the other, removes every source of doubt and difficulty. Only this is claimed: that for ought we know to the contrary, the difference in nature is just as satisfactory in the one case, as the tempter is in the other.

We may summarize thus:

As realities, angelic and human apostacies alike rest solely upon scriptural authority.

The only reason given for the fall of man, is the temptation of Satan. The only reason that can be conceived of for the fall of angels, is their difference from men.

The Scriptures do teach angelic apostacy, and they do teach that angels differ from men. Here then are two scriptural truths, the one the only reason that can be given for the other, and, so far as we can see, an all sufficient reason. So far, therefore, as reason reaches Scripture, we place the two apostacies side by side. If it is still objected, that the Bible connects the reason with the conclusion in the one case as it does not in the other, it will be answer enough to say, that one is presented directly and the other incidentally.

The conclusion now reached, that it is possible that temptation to evil may have its origin in an unfallen nature, and that thus angels were moved to rebel, it is believed will be materially strengthened by taking another scriptural truth into the account. We have insisted that there is a difference between angelic and human natures. It must now be added that in the scale of being, angels hold the higher rank. "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels." This not only shows a difference, but it shows also, to some extent, in what that difference consists. And as bearing upon the argument, a few points may be briefly noted.

Within certain limits, all human experience proves that elevation in rank endangers virtue. This is one point.

Another is, that, so far as we can know, subject to similar limitations, the same rule may apply to higher intelligences.

Still another is, that, from the nature of things, there must

be principles so fundamental as to necessarily have an application in common to all dependent and accountable creatures. And then we have only to suppose that the law of rank, as human experience is regulated by it, affects other intelligences similarly—and it would not be easy to name a law more fundamental—and we have at least a presumption which corroborates the position submitted. Of course, it will be urged, that holy and depraved beings are not necessarily affected in the same manner, and to the same extent, by the same laws. And of course this is admitted. And yet we must not overlook the humiliating truth, that the mass elevated virtue known on earth, even under the influence of grace, furnishes no exception to this rule.

The word *angel* has been repeatedly used to designate fallen beings. Sometimes, perhaps, improperly. It has been used thus as a matter of convenience, though under protest. It has, indeed, the sanction of Scripture. But, in some instances at least, *demons* are called *angels* in view of what they once were, rather than as expressive of what they now are. They once held the rank of *angels* in the proper sense of this word. To classify them as *angels* now, is to overlook a probable fact of great importance. It may be reasonably assumed that spiritual beings, unfallen and fallen, are alike progressive; and, accordingly, advancing in opposite directions, with a rapidity, perhaps, unknown to man, they must be separated by an immeasurable distance at the present time.

Scriptural intimations are suggestive of vast numbers. A writer of some note feels warranted in the "conjecture that they outnumber the human race." And the inquiry will force itself upon the mind, whether this vast multitude were all concerned in the first revolt, or whether by some means they have since received accessions. The question may be asked, but from whence is the answer to be derived? Is there any thing absurd, or even improbable, in the supposition, that the lost of our race, immediately after death, are mustered into the service of the "prince of this world," in his hostile assaults upon the kingdom of the Redeemer? Good angels are "all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for

them who shall be heirs of salvation." And that souls of departed saints are conducted by holy escorts as they ascend to the realms of light, and that they are welcomed to the associations and employments of the heavenly inhabitants, there can be no doubt. Is there less certainty that a converse experience awaits the wicked? The parallel between them and the righteous during the present life, and the corresponding alliances which the Bible teaches will exist in the life to come, establish at least a strong presumption, that the vast army of the great spiritual adversary is constantly increased from those on earth, who continue to be his vassals to the end of their probation.

So far as human nature is concerned, all error eventuates in distraction; and antagonistic elements enter essentially into the very essence of evil. Their forces, accordingly, are mutually repellant and tend to self-destruction. Hence the comparative weakness and the frequent failures of the allied powers of evil in their operations among men. Men disagree. Not so with fallen Spirits. "Devils with Devils damned firm concord hold." In their design there is unity; in their efforts, harmonious coöperation. Satan is never "divided against himself," nor in the many and diversified allusions scattered through the Scriptures can there be found a single intimation that "His angels" ever questioned his authority or became hostile to each other. On the contrary, from all that is said on this subject, the inference is inevitable that in the great conspiracy against God and all that is good, they are indissolubly bound together by a common aim and animated by a common purpose. To defeat the Divine plan respecting our race, as the grand end, and all the glorious means by which that end is to be attained, is not merely the *chief* object, but in reality the only object, to which their being and all their resources are devoted. Rebellion involves a forfeiture and a willful abandonment of the end of creature existence, while immortality necessitated the substitution of some other end consonant with the choice of the rebellious. Devils only live to disobey.

But to realize the full force of the unity of Apostate

Spirits in the accomplishment of their bad designs, another fact must be taken into the account. The hosts of hell are organized. They are under government. Within the impassible limits, fixed by God Himself, the ruling power of Evil is invested with a species of sovereignty. His supremacy as the "god of this world" is fully recognized, as is also the subserviency of the "rank and file" to the purposes of this vile compact. As pre-eminent in rank and authority, official titles, such as "the prince of this world," "the god of this word," "the prince of the power of the air," etc., are ascribed to the Devil. In exact correspondence with this, subordinate functionaries are denominated, "principalities," "powers," "rulers," while those subject to authority are called "devils," "angels," and other names which denote servility. Now, are these expressions meaningless? Did Christ and the Apostles use them merely to please the Jews, without intending to sanction the prevalent belief on this subject? Are they to be charged with a conservatism founded upon falsehood? Did they connive at a ruinous error, rather than provoke opposition? To ask such questions is to answer them. Martyrdom is not cowardice. Those who seal their testimony with their blood are not to be suspected of trifling with a system of truth which they hold dearer than life itself. The Scriptures do, accordingly, recognize as established among Apostate Spirits, rank, rule, authority, submission; in other words, government. They are organized with a view to a purpose. Their movements are regulated by law. Disloyalty is unknown among them. No separate or secondary interests or aspirations occasion discord. The love of life is lost in concentrating and unrelenting hatred and hostility to the doings and designs of God. All pride and power are subordinated to their fiendish plots. In the execution of these plots, no service is too menial, no sacrifice too great. The wisdom to plan, the courage to dare, the firmness to endure, are placed in unreserved consecration upon this infernal shrine. The end of their combinations is the ruin of the race; their highest delight the hopeless damnation of the immortal soul.

We come now to the inquiry, What is the extent of this "power of darkness?" What agencies does the Devil control? Of what forces is he master? To what extent may he prevail against God, against His cause, and against His creatures?

And here let no Manichæan notions find a place. The conclusions to which the Scriptures conduct us are, indeed, most startling. The titles mentioned are surely not meaningless. But yet the power of evil, in none of its modifications, can transcend divine permission. It is neither co-ordinate with the power of God, nor can it be exercised to any extent beyond His control. God's purposes cannot be defeated by it. The Devil and his angels can only do what God allows them to do. They have no guaranteed rights to tempt and torture, secure from Divine interference. Precedents only establish liabilities. The license granted in the case of Job, so far as we know, may never again be repeated. And yet it may be. Even such extremities may be permitted because they can be, as in that instance they were, overruled for good. And in the contemplation of every phase of this dark and dreadful subject, let it not for one moment be forgotten, that the end of all is God's glory, and that end is sure. He is over all, blessed for evermore. Hell not less than heaven is subject to His rule. What He permits, as well as what He appoints, answers to His ultimate designs. All error and all evil, however essentially at variance with the Divine nature and will, in the conclusive issue, will just as really and just as effectually, as truth and right, vindicate the honor of His name and the justice of His government. Devils, with relentless hate, seek to delay and to defeat God's gracious purposes towards our fallen race, while angels of light are employed in such ministrations of mercy as the economy of redemption may require. By means of both classes of agencies, shall the intelligent universe be brought to recognize the rectitude, the wisdom, the beneficence of God's eternal, universal, and finally undisputed supremacy.

There is yet another feature of this same far-reaching

truth, to which, briefly, in this connection, attention should be directed. Left to himself, man is not an inevitable slave to the Adversary. Except, perhaps, in a given condition, and in that only to a limited extent, Satan can have no absolute control over him. He cannot coerce his will, he cannot compel his vassalage. Man has the same ability to resist temptation to evil, that he has to yield to the motives of virtue. He is as responsible in the one case as in the other, and his responsibility rests upon the same foundation. He can "resist the Devil." Only as he is affected by physical forces under satanic control, does he become a helpless victim of his devices.

It remains for us to notice one of the most important questions relating to this subject. It is important because it is practical. It is comprehensive too, and hence as this is answered others must be. The question is this: *To what extent are the evils, to which our race is liable, traceable to Satan and his allies?* Is he the source whence *all* our evils come? If so, in what sense does he cause them? If not, to what other source can any portion of them be traced, and where is the line of distinction to be drawn?

To meet these inquiries fairly, a clear conception of what should be meant by *evils* must be secured. We use the plural because it evidently accords best with our habits of thinking. The usual classifications of *physical* and *moral* evils will be accepted. And it will be taken for granted that by physical evils is to be understood everything by which man, as a physical being, is subjected to inconveniences. Thus, the condition of the ground is such, as a consequence of the curse, that incessant toil is necessary to secure from it the means of subsistence. So, too, as occasioned by the fall, the human body is in a state which renders excruciating sufferings inevitable accompaniments of the propagation of the species. These are physical evils. So are diseases, however caused, as also all accidents Nor is the death of the body, in this connection, to be overlooked. In a word, whatever interferes with, or in any measure embarrasses, the felicitous accomplishment of man's mission, as a physical being, is to be classed

among physical evils. By moral evils we mean sins of every sort, their proximate causes and legitimate consequences, as they bear upon our moral nature.

Now, to these two classes of evils the human family as a whole, always and everywhere, have been, and continue to be, subject. The only differences, have been differences of kind and degree. No generical evils have become extinct. In man's liabilities no material changes have occurred. To all the pains and privations, all the temptations and susceptibilities to which he ever was subject, he remains subject still. Constitutionally, and circumstantially, he is what he has been. Remedial agencies, to a greater or less extent, have diminished the power and restricted the scope of evil, so far as they have been effectively applied. But to-day, as heretofore, evil is predominant and universal. Now, *is this stupendous and complicated system of evil controlled by the "Devil and his angels?"*

An unqualified affirmative answer is, perhaps, hardly warranted by the common sentiment of Christendom. Distinctive sources of evil seem to be recognized. And yet, if a formulated statement of the faith of the Church upon this question is demanded, where shall it be found? Perhaps such a statement *should not* have a place in her creeds; but is it unreasonable to look for it in her literature? But, as it is *not* the object, in this paper, to depend for proof upon the history of the doctrine, it will not be needful to examine to what extent different authors have expressed themselves respecting it.

Let permission be granted to declare at once the position to be maintained, though, perchance, possible issue may be made with some for whose opinions profound respect is cherished.

Our proposition is, that *there is but one source of evil;* one "power of darkness;" one "father of lies;" one author of "all mischief;" one "spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience." "The god of this world" rules the entire realm of evil, subject to such limitations as have already been indicated. We have no knowledge of evil back of the apostacy

of angels. And in all its modifications and operations, it is, and must be, traced to the same source.

In the support of this conclusion, an appeal will first be made to the nature of things. The suggestions of reason respecting what is and must be true, are not to be ignored.

Evil—everything which antagonizes the well-being of rational intelligences—is the effects of sin. In the absence of sin the existence of evil is not supposable. God is not the author of sin, and consequently not the author of evil. Opposing elements do not enter into the Divine Essence, nor is the kingdom of heaven divided against itself. God is essentially good. Evil is essentially opposed to good. Accordingly, evil cannot proceed from God. To question either proposition is to question the eternal distinction between good and evil. Destroy this distinction and the difference between right and wrong ceases, and the foundation of accountability is subverted. Good and evil are necessarily antagonistic. The one cannot be the product of the other. Both cannot proceed from the same source. God cannot be the author of evil. It did not have its origin with man, as it existed before the creation. As a consequence, apostate spirits being the only class of evil intelligences of which we have any knowledge before the fall of man, and to whom the fall is directly ascribed, we can trace it no farther. Here our researches must end, and the presumption is that here evil had its origin.

Nothing is gained by taking exception in favor of physical evil at this point. The conclusions arrived at have no discriminating application. Physical evil is productive of creature suffering. This in itself is an evil. And it is just as inconsistent to suppose that suffering is a product of infinite goodness, as it is to suppose that sin proceeds from infinite purity. In the ultimate result, is it not precisely as absurd to assume that God destroys the harvest by a hail storm, desolates the town by a tornado, or swallows up the city by an earthquake, as it is to assume that He creates the appetite of the inebriate, the lust of the libertine, the motive of the murderer? The cases, of course, are very different in them-

selves considered, and very different in their bearings upon man. But how is the one more than the other to be reconciled with the idea of infinite goodness as its source? In a sinless state, can the one exist any more than the other? A negative to this question is a concession that physical and moral evil sustain the same relation to sin as their cause.

But does not God accept evil as an element of his own economy, and so regulate it as to subserve His own purposes? Such an assumption may be true or false, according to the construction which is put upon it. If by it is meant, that God has accommodated His government to rebellion, and that He regards obedience and disobedience with indistinguishable complacency or connivance, it amounts to logical nonsense and religious blasphemy. But if by it is meant that God so overrules and disposes of all evil as to promote the interests of His own kingdom and the welfare of His loyal subjects, the powers of evil to the contrary notwithstanding, of course it is true. This is just what we claim. But does this relieve Satan as the source of evil? Does it make God the author? And so God permits what He does not approve. He overrules what He does not appoint. He makes such disposition of evil as to defeat its own tendencies. And He does this just as certainly and just as effectually respecting moral evil, as He does respecting physical evil. "All things work together for good."

Of course, it will be said, that what have been designated as physical evils, are effects of natural causes, that they are governed by fixed laws, and that satanic agency has no more control over them than it has over the rising and the setting of the Sun, or the changing of the seasons. It has, indeed, been asserted again and again, that the material world is not affected by the moral constitution of the race; that fires and floods, that miasmatic climates and consequent epidemics, "the pestilence that walketh in darkness," and "the destruction that wasteth at noon day," if sin had not entered, would as certainly, and to the same extent, have swept over the world as now.

Now, all that really need be said in reply, is, that this

is the merest assumption, associated with the sheerest absurdity. One hardly knows whether to treat it with silence or contempt. Who has shown, or who can show, that physical causes are free from satanical interference? And how simply preposterous the assumption that there is no reciprocal power between the moral and the material world! Is not the state of the country affected by the character of the people? Are mind and morals less subject to law than matter is? Has God less to do with moral than with physical laws? Is it not just as reasonable to suppose that God may permit the forces of nature to overleap their bounds, as in the case of the flood, for the punishment of an abandoned people, as it is to suppose that He may permit a people to become abandoned, a supposition which everybody knows involves a terrible reality?

But all that may be claimed respecting natural causes, may be conceded without damage to the point to be sustained,—that those causes within certain limits, by Divine permission, are under the control of satanic agency. Let us admit, if the demand is made, that, had not sin found way into our world, the fixed laws which now control it, would have made it subject to all the dire reverses which it now endures; that storms would have swept its surface; deadly vapors loaded its atmosphere, and the pent-up heavens refused to relieve its parched acres: what then? Does it follow that sinless man would have been, as now he is, the victim of them all? The simoon of the desert, where there is no life, is not an evil, whatever may be its fury; nor, were life there, would it be, if protected from its destructive power. Evil consists in injury to intelligent beings. Shield humanity; then let subterranean fires burst forth and wrap the earth in flames, no evil will ensue. There can be no evil where there is no sin. Hence, it matters not, so far as the argument is concerned, whether the elements became armed with evil by sin, or whether they were invested with all their present power before the fall, and man became exposed to their fury, when he parted with the shield of his innocence.

It would not be difficult, we think, to derive a strong pre-

sumptive argument in favor of the doctrine, that Satan, is the sole source of evil, from the history of the moral condition of the race. Since the fall, man has been in rebellion against the Divine government. Sin has been universally and unceasingly prevalent. Here is one conclusion to which we are conducted by this history. Another is, that from the first, there has been in active operation a combination of antagonizing forces sufficient to overcome this rebellion, if man alone had been concerned in it. Some powerful elements of our nature have never been fully overcome by evil. Conscience has always protested against disloyalty. So have our fears. And in the darkest depravity, we have never lost sight of the distinction between right and wrong, nor of the connection between cause and effect. Another fact is, that some of the most prevalent and most ruinous sins of the race find little direct support in our nature, depraved as it is. They are unnatural and are propagated and sustained mainly by habit and education. Every body sees the difference between idolatry and licentiousness. And since the promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, the remedial system has been more or less effectively in operation. Light has been increasing. The benefits resulting from virtue have been made more and more apparent and attractive. And so too the consequences of disobedience have been rendered more and more distinctive and appalling. God has not left the race to itself. At "sundry times and in diverse manners" He has caused His voice to be heard and His claims to be felt. Means of instruction, encouragement, rebuke, correction, in endless variety, have been used with a view to moral improvement. And the proposition to be submitted is that, depraved as our nature is, but for the perverting, distracting and opposing powers of darkness, the human family would have attained to a much more exalted state of excellence than can now be claimed in its behalf. The suggestion therefore is, that during every stage of our history, a combination of powerful agencies has been encountered, the design of which has been to perpetuate and intensify man's rebellious disposition towards his Maker. All God's dealings

with him have tended to his restoration. Some of the most effective forces of his own nature have been co-operative with the Divine purposes. It seems impossible, accordingly, to rationally account for the present moral condition of mankind, only as the scriptural explanation is accepted.

But we cannot fully traverse this fruitful field of research. It is not needful we should. This brief allusion to it has been made that it may be properly associated with the scripture view, which is now more particularly to claim attention. Reason never supersedes, but always harmonizes with, revelation. Neither is to be ignored.

The exact question respecting which we are now to consult, "the law and the testimony," is whether all evil is traceable to the same source; whether through all proximate causes and intermediate agencies, the connection between the entire system and the "god of this world" can be established.

In replying to this inquiry our first position is, that *the Word of God, without any discrimination, recognizes Satan as the source of evil.*

There are several classes of texts which bear upon this point, some of each of which will be examined.

"The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil." Matt. 13 : 38, 39.

Only three things here need be noticed:

The scope of the parable; "the field is the world." The condition of the entire race is represented. Such world-wide expressions admit of no restrictive applications.

The contrast of character and designation of the preponderating class. "The good seed—the children of the kingdom" can mean only those who have been translated from the power of darkness." "The tares—the children of the wicked one," of course include all not embraced in the other class. All who are not saints are sinners. All saints have been sinners. All, accordingly, have been "the children of the wicked one."

The relation of the Devil to the tares. They are *his chil-*

dren, he sowed them. In other words, he originated and controlled the evil of their nature.

The passage in John, 8 : 44, "Ye are of your father the Devil," etc., is so exactly parallel with this, so far as concerns this point, that it requires no separate notice. Both teach, without any qualification, that Satan propagates and disseminates all evil all through the race.

A very significant passage of similar import, is found in Rev. 12 : 9. Without even a metaphorical intervention, it is directly asserted, that the "old Serpent, called the Devil and Satan—deceiveth the whole world." Universal deception is universal evil, and must, accordingly, involve every conceivable form of evil.

Another class of texts teach that to overcome evil, we must overcome the Devil. In other words, that the power of evil is controlled by the Devil. Only two passages will be quoted.

"Or else, how can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man." Matt. 12 : 29.

"That they may recover themselves out of the snare of the Devil, who are taken captive by him at his will." 2 Tim. 2 : 26.

However these passages may be construed, they inevitably conduct us to two conclusions: one is, that man is in bondage to the Devil: the other is, that to escape from this bondage, the power of the Devil must be broken.

There is yet another class of texts, to only one of which attention will be called.

"And the Devil taketh Him up into a high mountain," etc. Luke 4 : 5, 6.

Interpret this fearful passage as we may, there is no escape from the following conclusions:

Christ was not exposed to the power of the Devil to a greater extent than mere human beings are.

The Devil claimed the power over "the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them."

Christ made no issue respecting this claim. He met the

temptation. He repelled the offer. But neither by expression nor implication, did He question the right or the power of the devil to make or fulfill the proposal. Only in regard to the conditions made, did He resent the offer. And who will raise the question whether, had Christ recognized satanic supremacy, He might not have realized all that was promised, in the sense in which that promise is to be understood?

Combining these several classes of passages, and each class is somewhat numerous, and, without doubt, they fully justify the general proposition, that the power of the Devil over evil is unqualifiedly recognized by the Scriptures.

We now take another position. *The Word of God does not recognize any other source of evil.* This demands little more than a distinct statement. In effect it has already been insisted upon. We have seen that God is not the source of evil. We have seen too that man is not. Evil existed before man was created. It may, however, here be added, that evil, as endured, practiced and propagated by man, is traceable to "the Spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience." It can scarcely be necessary to insist that such expressions as represent God as the author of evil, the most remarkable of which is perhaps found in Isaiah—"I make peace, and create evil"—must be understood in the sense either of permission or of punishment.

A third general position remains to be stated. Of all others, it is the most comprehensive, and, in some respects, it is the most important. It is this:

The Bible recognizes the power of the Devil over all the agencies, instrumentalities, and influences which are called in requisition in the maintainance, propagation, and infliction of evil upon mankind.

We shall need to be on our guard against confusion of thought. Unnecessary distinctions will accordingly be avoided. Our object will not require us to examine direct and indirect operations separately. Nor will it be worth while to discriminate between the doings of the "Devil and his angels." But every argument must be fairly subjected to two inquiries; one is whether the means to be considered tend to

evil, the other is whether they are under the control of fallen spirits.

The human mind is susceptible of influence. Other beings bring a power to bear upon us which causes us to think, and act, and feel as we would not, were we left to ourselves. Influence, from whatever source, of whatever character, though capable of many modifications, must operate with more or less uniformity. In this, as in other things, like causes, under like circumstances, produce like effects. There must be adaptation with a view to given results. The motive must be suited to the mind. Temptation presupposes that the tempter understands the person to be assailed. And this accords with the teaching of God's word. Everywhere it assumes that evil spirits have an extensive and accurate knowledge of human nature. They are master of its capabilities, of the laws which govern it, and of the means by which it can be moved in given directions. They have the power, and know how to exercise it, to suggest thought; to excite feeling; to influence passion; to stimulate imagination; to engender skepticism; to disarm fear; to beget recklessness; to create attachment to evil and aversion to all that is good: in a word, to dispose and direct the tempted so as to fascinate them with some form of evil, and to fortify them against all protective influences. And such is the multiplicity of their numbers, the unity of their designs, the celerity of their movements, the versatility of their natures, that, having such access to the mind, they seem to have a sort of general guarantee of success in the facilities which they possess. That they are capable of assuming different characters, and of becoming visible or invisible at will, there can be little doubt. Operating simultaneously upon different minds, in different places, by different means, so as to secure at the same time extension and concentration of their influence, they possess themselves of a species of potential ubiquity. A given condition of things which, in different persons under gracious influence, will excite pity, forbearance, magnanimity; in different persons, under the power of evil, may awaken prejudice, enmity, malevolence. And thus Satan

transforms love into lust, prudence into avarice, economy into meanness, and commendable aspiration into vaulting ambition.

And the power thus exercised is immeasurably augmented by the control which evil spirits evidently have over material things, and the relation which mind sustains to them. They affect, and, to a greater or less extent, regulate the senses as well as the mental and moral faculties. As turned to the objects of temptation, sight suggests and stimulates; sound ravishes and enchains; taste intoxicates; touch infatuates. Facts and tangible objects are so distorted, thrown into such relations to each other, and contemplated only from such points of observation as make them suggestive of the most pernicious conclusions. Indeed, temptation is deception, and deception is falsehood. Accordingly, the Scriptures, with awful significance, represent the Devil as a liar and the father of lies.

Now, it is believed, that this representation in no respect either misrepresents or transcends the Bible view of this subject. Thus our first parents were tempted. Thus our Saviour was assailed. Thus Satan by his devices gets the advantage of men in our day. Thus "the Spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience" begets in them "all manner of concupiscence." And thus it will be seen that all our mental, moral, and physical endowments, all the incoming and outflowing forces of our nature, all our surroundings and relations, are within the scope of the "power of darkness."

From what has now been said, it must be apparent that, to the extent that men become the vassals of the Devil, their activities and their influence must harmonize with his hellish designs. They become devilish in the Devil's service. Hence wicked men, whether in the body or out of it, both before and after death, constitute a part of the "power of darkness."

There seems to be more difficulty and more doubt in most minds respecting Satanic control over the physical world, than in regard to any other part of the subject. The fact that, within certain limits, he exercises such control, is not a question. And it will lessen our perplexities to constantly

keep in mind that evil can never transcend Divine permission. Evil Spirits absolutely can do nothing except what God allows them to do. But He does permit Satan to assume and wield a sort of sovereignty, both in the moral and in the physical world. Satan does, to some extent, control the laws of mind and of matter. And, evidently, it is just as consistent with the Divine economy, that he should be permitted to exercise his power in the one department as in the other. Why should he not as well control the wind as to control thought? Why not as well fill the air with malaria, as infuse impurity into the soul? Who will determine why the one is not just as conceivable and just as reasonable as the other? Who will tell us why it is not as conceivable and as reasonable, that the great Adversary should be allowed to wield all the power ascribed to him in the Scriptures, as that he should be allowed to wield any power? We do know that there is a connection between mind and matter, and that mind has some control over matter. We do know that there is a *nexus* between man's soul and body, and that his soul largely moves and regulates his body. What this connection is, or by what process the one affects the other, we do not know, nor can we know. Now, in the case of Job, Satan controlled not only the Sabeans and the Chaldeans, but the wind, and the fire, and the different types and degrees of the diseases with which the man of Uz was smitten, as well. Is it any more difficult to harmonize the tremendous license which was granted to Satan, with God's character and economy, than it is to account for the liberty which is allowed to wicked men, to corrupt, defraud, and destroy each other, so that this liberty will not be found in conflict with the idea of infinite goodness? The simple truth is, and it accords with the facts of experience and the teachings of Scripture, that evil spirits have their sphere, beyond which, except by special permission, they are not allowed to extend their operations. This accords exactly too, with our conception of an established order of things. It is in correspondence with the Divine government over human beings. There are fixed

boundaries beyond which wicked men may not extend their influence.

After all, what is evil, but good abused and perverted? The laws of matter and of mind, as God establised them, were all very good and tended only to good. Satan perverts, and, as instigated by him, man abuses these laws, and here the evil lies. The facts are alarmingly apparent; the ultimate reasons who will explain! Evil is a dreadful reality. The moral and the physical are both affected by it. Only God can fix limits to it in either. But why not at once accept, without cavil or equivocation, the terrible truth, so impressively set forth in the experience of Job, and so clearly sustained in every part of the sacred volume? By flames and storms, by fraud and violence, by disease and death, Satan robbed Job of his property, bereaved him of his childen, took possession of and turned against him the wife of his bosom, brought upon him the most intolerable diseases, and but for specific prohibition, would have taken his life. Similar calamities are met now; what right have we to say they come from any other source? Do we lessen the number or lighten the load, by dividing them up between God and the Devil? Can such a division be made without compromising infinite goodness, and under-estimating the strength of infernal malignity? In language too memorable to be overlooked, too clear to be misapprehended, Christ declared that the woman, whom He relieved on the Sabbath day, had been "bound by Satan, lo, these eighteen years." In numerous other instances He charged the Devil as the cause of sickness and of suffering. And with equal clearness, without any qualification, the Apostle places "the power of death" in the hands of the Devil. Should any claim, that this and other like texts must be interpreted subject to implied limitations, we press the question, *why;* we ask for proof: we demand that the line of demarcation be drawn. There is here but one line to be recognized, and that is the line between good and evil. This is established in the nature of things, and Divine authority never permits it to be overlooked. On the one side we see the works of God, on the other the works of

the Devil. God means to make His creatures understand that hell will do its worst. And He means to make us understand, too, that such is the "power of darkness," that our only hope against it must rest in the "Son of God," who "was manifested that He might destroy the works of the Devil."

But there still seems to be a source of shadow. The mind shrinks from the conclusion that satanic agency is so closely associated with all sorts of human sufferings. We want to see the hand of God in them. All are disciplinary. All indicate a Father's love. "Whom the Lord loveth, He chasteneth." If Satan causes them, how is it that God's blessings accompany them? May not the rod be in the hand of the enemy, and the blow be regulated by Him who has absolute control of the enemy? We must distinguish between the motive of the agent and the design of the ruler. We have no reason to complain of or fear the prevalence and power of malevolence, so long as all its operations are governed by infinite goodness. Only let Joseph, and Job, and Cyrus be remembered. And if we must still insist that these are extraordinary instances, we have only to bear in mind, that God regulates the raging tempest as well as the gentle breeze.

The moral purposes subserved by the universality, perpetuity, and terrible efficiency of the power of darkness, existing by Divine permission, is another vast field of inquiry to which this subject directs attention. But, as has already been intimated, it may be more advantageously contemplated from another point of observation. And yet completeness requires that a few points should be briefly noted.

The human mind can not be enslaved without its own consent. Those only are in bondage to the Devil who choose to be. As we are situated and affected by sin, our vassalage is a preparation for our freedom. "God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin."

We always meet the Devil in the presence of God. With His eye on us and His hand on him, satanic power will only subserve the Divine purposes.

Christ encountered and defeated the power of darkness.

The fearful shafts of the enemy fell harmless at His feet. He fully demonstrated the practicability of resisting temptation. The sovereignty of Satan was effectually disputed and his prestige was destroyed. The possibility of invulnerable virtue was exemplified. The trial of the "second Adam" ended in triumph. In Him we are "more than conquerors." The captain of our salvation is able to succor all who are tempted.

The toleration of evil spirits in their ceaseless assaults upon God's gracious economy, is further explained by the fact, that our race is developed and disciplined as otherwise it could not be, by the vigilance and struggles thus rendered inevitable. Man rises to excellence about in proportion as his godlike qualifications are legitimately brought in requisition. And nothing so deeply and decidedly stirs and calls forth his energies as opposition; nothing so invincibly sustains his courage, as the assurance of conquest. In this contest a powerful appeal is made to these susceptibilities of our nature. As we "wrestle against principalities and powers," we are driven by necessity to make use of the "whole armor of God." We fight, "not as one who beats the air." And we are sure of victory. Hell's dread empire is to be overthrown. "All rule, and all authority and power," are to be put under the Redeemer's feet. Death, the last dread ally of the Devil, shall be destroyed. Then shall the end come. The great rebellion will cease. The kingdom will be delivered up to God, even the Father, and He will be "all in all." The Devil and his angels, and all of our race allied with them, shall be doomed to merited punishment.

Thus the arch-conspirator against the govenment of God, with all the forces he could enlist from heaven, earth, and hell, with power and privilege, time and opportunity granted, which, to short-sighted mortals have seemed to imply either Divine connivance or surrender, is doomed to complete and final failure.

What then? From this awful struggle, what will have been gained? Out of so much evil, how much good?

The rightful supremacy of Jehovah will be maintained. Uncompromising justice will be vindicated. The hopeless-

ness and dire consequences of rebellion will be exemplified. The loyalty of the intelligent universe will be eternally secured.

A brief statement of the practical bearings of the view, which has now been submitted, upon the Demonology of the New Testament, will close the article.

The cases in which persons are said to have been possessed with devils, are perhaps no more mysterious than many diseases from which, in some respects, they are not distinguishable. All sufferings are the effects of sin. If man were not a fallen being, he would be no more liable to fever than to lunacy. In the days of Christ he was, and now is, exposed to both, as the victim of the power of evil. He is drawn into enervating excesses, or is driven to encounters with hostile elements, by which he is overcome, and thus, either by his weakness or by his wickedness, he falls a prey to the deadly influence. He is tempted, ensnared, overcome. And he is possessed by the Devil, just in proportion as the disease of his body, or the derangement of his mind, becomes uncontrollable. The only real difference between the possessed of Gadara and the paralytic of Capernaum, was a difference of form and degree. And such differences are seen now. Who needs to be told that all the modifications and extremities of helplessness and frenzy recorded of the wretched sufferers of those times, are fully exemplified at the present day. A visit to the insane asylum, will enable any one to witness all the manifestations of human nature under the power of evil, which were seen among the masses of the afflicted, which crowded the pathway of our Saviour for relief, while He was upon the earth. And these terrible assaults are just as much the work of the Devil now as they were then. Nor is the seemingly absurd idea of several evil spirits taking possession of the same person at the same time, either inexplicable or irrational. It surely is not an uncommon occurrence for a person to become the victim of a complication of diseases, all, perhaps, superinduced by some indiscretion of his own, and resulting, it may be, in disclosures as dreadful and as hu-

miliating as were those of the demoniacs of the New Testament.

The doctrine of the real existence, personality and combined activity of evil spirits, is not to be trifled with. It is not to be ignored. The pulpit is not to be ridiculed into silence respecting it. As a doctrine of revelation and of experience, it should be studied that it may be understood. Our dangers, not less than our advantages, demand attention. If we would not be deceived and led captive by the Devil at his will, we must not be "ignorant of his devices."

ARTICLE VI.

THE FULNESS OF CHRIST.

By Rev. Van Alstine, Raymertown, N. Y.

This subject invites thorough investigation. It will tax all the powers of mind and heart, to understand and wisely discriminate between truth and error. It is no disparagement of the mental faculties, nor a mystification of the subject, to say, that we are inadequate to the task, and that it transcends a full analysis; yet we should not feel confounded or disheartened, and retire from the effort to study and to unfold it. Assuredly we shall find valuable truths and thought, which will well repay for the time and effort bestowed. It will not be in vain, if we give only an outline of the doctrine, with a few phases of thought.

If this subject is anywhere ably expounded, we shall find it in the Epistles of the apostle Paul. He looks at the doctrine from this standpoint: *It pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell.*" This Paul regarded as a simple fact, full and comprehensive. As such we must receive it and rejoice in it, for Christ is our all in all. Paul was fully persuaded, that all Christians, by their experience of redemption, its fulness, power, and glory, would be better qualified to understand and appreciate the glory and fulness of the Person of Christ. He had an intense anxiety, that all

who begin a religious life, should quickly graduate the life of a novice, and become mature Christians, ripe and perfect; to be filled with the knowledge of Christ, be worthy of their high calling, be well-pleasing in the sight of God, be vigorous by His effective energy, be full of long-suffering and patience with a joyful heart, and thus be spiritually qualified for the inheritance of the saints of light; for then they would have no doubt of their translation from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of grace, and in due time into future glory.

To effect such a blessed work in the hearts of all believers, to bring them into a state of spiritual refinement and joy, such ripeness of religious experience and perfection, Christ in His fulness is adequate. Not only in the dignity of His person, but also in the fulness of His attributes, sovereign grace, wonder-working power and glory, He stands as the head of the universe, the chief of all things in the earth and in heaven; both the material and spiritual worlds are dependant upon His upholding and governing hand; His royal sceptre is over all and should be obeyed.

1. Christ in His fulness is chief of the physical world. In the fulness of the Son of God was born the ideal conception of the world. He was fully adequate for this stupendous work, though it required a Divine Being, infinite in all His attributes, to create a world. We are assured, that by Christ all things were made; nothing began to exist without Him, and that He upholds all things by His power. He is unoriginated, filling infinite space, conscious of a perfect conception of Himself and a complete survey of the ideal universe in all its heights and depths, mysteries, laws, and results.

He was the God of Eternity, Omnipresent; with Him the past and the future are blended into the present. Such is God, and such is the Son of God, infinite in all His perfections, the Creator of the world both material and spiritual, all to redound to His praise and glory. What else is consistent with the bold and lofty conception of the inspired apostle, when he says, "that in Christ all fulness dwelt?" Though in Him was the Godhead, yet he became incarnate,

He moved and dwelt among men, full of grace and truth. And as soon as the broad and infinite conception of this Being, a conception inexpressibly grand as a whole and in all its parts, complete in order and perfection was embodied, there rolled out of His plastic hand a world-reality. What else should we see in this creative act but an unquestionable evidence of the fulness of the Son of God?

Christ, therefore, possessed the perfections of God. If He possessed one infinite attribute, then all; if not all, then none. He possessed all, not by delegation, but by an unoriginated right; for if by delegation, then the Being who once was God would cease to be God, and He who once was not God, would thus become God. What else is this but a logical absurdity? Christ had the attribute of eternity, He was therefore the first and the last, the Alpha and Omega. "The same was in the beginning with God." (Jno. 1 : 2.) "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory I had with thee before the world was." (Jno. 17 : 5.) "And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, fear not, I am the first and the last: I am He that liveth and was dead; and behold I am alive for evermore; Amen; I have the keys of hell and of death." (Rev. 1 : 17) "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last." (Rev. 22 : 13.) We are authorized to believe, that Christ existed in eternity, was before all time and the period of creation, possessed co-equally the ineffable glory of the Father, the First and the Last, God over all, blessed for evermore. Such a Being certainly possessed the fulness of the Godhead, therefore must be God.

If possessed of the attribute of eternity, he must of necessity possess every infinite perfection. He was infinite in power, illimitable in presence, infinite in knowledge, wisdom, goodness and holiness, unchangeable in His nature and purposes. "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever." (Heb. 13 : 8.) Christ being infinite, there can be no increase of His perfection, nor decrease. What He was before creation, He will continue to be for ever; the same in

perfection, fulness and glory. Creation only made manifest His power, wisdom and goodness, and did not constitute Him God. "He was in the world and the world was made by Him." (Jno. 1 : 16.) "And thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hand. They shall perish, but Thou remainest." (Heb. 1 : 10, 11.) The world was made by Him; He also governs and upholds it for His ultimate glory.

To create the world, this stupendous and complicated structure, required nothing less than infinite wisdom and power, and nothing less to regulate the same, to guide and govern its motion and secure its original design. For this reason the Bible teaches us that all things were made for Christ, and that He upholds all things. All things were committed into His hand, whether things on earth, or in heaven, for in Him all fulness dwells. Paul says, "For by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him and for Him: and He is before all things and by Him all things consist." (Col. 1 : 16, 17). "Who being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power." (Heb. 1 : 3). Christ is the head of the material universe. He was before any created thing had any existence, therefore the cause of all things, for by Him, and for Him as the end, the world was made, and on Him it depends for support and perpetuation. This doctrine, taught by the apostle, is conclusive, and cannot fail to prove the fulness of Christ, and that He is the chief of the material and spiritual world—the whole universe in its totality. What a great and adorable being Christ is, was, and shall forever be. How consistent the command, "Let all the angels of God worship Him."

The prerogative to create, uphold, guide, and govern all things, visible and invisible, is not the only one with which He is invested, clearly manifesting His Godhead; but He also possesses the prerogative, and He is the only being who absolutely possesses it, to forgive and save from sin. To for-

give sin indicates His fulness, for who besides God can do this difficult and wonderful work? The Jews believed that God alone could forgive sin, therefore they charged Christ with the crime of blasphemy, when He said to a man sick and palsied, "Thy sins are forgiven thee." When the people brought a man unto Christ, afflicted with the palsy, to be healed, and He witnessed the strength and purity of their faith, He said to the man "Take up thy bed and walk." The man was thoroughly healed and went his way rejoicing. Christ, as the Son of God, gave positive proof that He had, and could exercise, this prerogative, therefore He was the true God. Peter also affirmed this doctrine, and Christ's exaltation was a full confirmation. "Him hath God exalted with His right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins." (Acts 5 : 31). The prerogative to forgive sin is proof that the being who is invested with it, is the chief executive of the universe, above all law in the moral government, and that He has the unqualified right to pardon and reprieve without injustice or dishonor to God. No one beside the Moral Ruler can reprieve, if therefore Christ exercised this prerogative, it is evident, that in Him dwelt the fulness of the Godhead.

The fulness of Christ was also manifest in His power to raise the dead. The author of life in creation, can reorganize and give life to the dead. He who made the delicate structure of the ear and eye, can cause the ears and eyes of the dead to hear and see, at the blast of the archangel's trumpet, and restore natural life to bodies long ago dissolved in their graves. This divine power Christ rightly declared He possessed and could exercise whenever disposed so to do. With Him the resurrection-power and life were always present, for it was His indisputable prerogative to raise the dead. He said, "I am the resurrection and the life"—"all who believe in me shall live"—"because I live, they shall live also."

Christ taught His disciples and the human race, that He stood on a *perfect equality* with the Father, not only in works and honor, but also in divine attributes—in unoriginated prerogatives. "For as the Father raiseth the dead and quicken-

eth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom He will." (Jno. 5 : 21). "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body, according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto himself." (Phil. 3 : 21). This prerogative of Christ was a conclusive evidence that He was the true Messiah and no deceiver, that all the doctrines He taught were the essential truths of Christianity; positive proof of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul and of eternal life in reservation for the saints of God. The apostles, on almost every occasion, preached the resurrection of Christ as proof of the divinity of His teachings, and in confirmation of the doctrines they proclaimed, to console and inspire the people of God with hope of final salvation from all their afflictions and bereavements, and even in the last dark hour, when treading the crumbling margin of the grave. We are thus fully assured that life and death are subject to the power of Christ; not only is He able to rejuvenate the face of nature with life, bloom and beauty, but also to renew and transform the moral world unto the likeness of God, to fit all hearts to abide with Him in His glory.

The fulness of Christ is seen in His right to judge the world. All judgment is vested in Him as the God-man; as the incarnate God. To execute this work wisely, impartially, and decisively, He must be possessed of omniscience; all things must lie naked and open to His eye; His dominion be co-extensive with the broad universe; His power and authority must be equal to the task of summoning all intelligences before His judgment-seat, to correctly investigate moral character and determine the destiny of our race. It is said, He will judge the living and dead; all will appear before His tribunal to give account of all the deeds done in the body, whether good or bad. Who then shall present themselves before the Judge to take exceptions to the rules, the right and the qualification of Christ to sit in judgment on all the earth? Shall the holy angels, who are God's agents of mercy and wrath, who behold His glory with enraptured gaze, or acquiesce in the lowering clouds of His fierce indignation?

Shall the saints, redeemed, crowned, and glorified, and who have been adjudged worthy to abide in the beauties of holiness and enjoy eternal life? Shall the sinful, debased and polluted, who are now banished forever from grace and heaven, lift up their voice in reproach and blasphemy against Christ, the Judge, for His righteous decision and for their fearful destiny? Instead of this, they will cry out and say, just and righteous art Thou, Thou King of saints, in all Thy ways, because Thou hast judged thus. Christ alone is qualified and is fully invested with the right and authority to judge the world as the Son of Man; all judgments are committed into His hand, of which we have proof by His resurrection from the dead.

The fulness of Christ is indicated by the fact, that in dignity He stands in *comparison* with the Father. Christ, in addressing the Father, says: "I have glorified Thee on the earth: I have finished the work thou gavest me to do." (Jno. 17 : 4). It is required of all worshipers to honor the Son as they honor the Father; to fail in such worship, is not only a dishonor of Christ, but also will neutralize all true worship of the Father. Christ is not less entitled to all heartfelt and supreme worship than the Father. Both have an equal claim to the supreme worship of all intelligent beings, as both are equal in nature, power, and glory. The inspired word says, "How God also anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power; who went about doing good and healing all who were oppressed of the devil; for God was with Him." (Acts 10 : 38). No distinction is made between Christ and the Father in the attributes of knowledge and wisdom. "I know that His commandment is life everlasting; whatsoever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." (Jno. 12 : 50). We see the same evidence in the attribute of goodness. No being is absolutely and superlatively good, except God, yet Christ feels it no unjust assumption to claim supreme goodness, for He said to a certain young man, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." (Matt. 19 : 17). The fact

that goodness was attributed to Him, and then in the realm of truth there is none good but God, and yet we hear no protest from the lips of Christ that He was not entitled to such exalted distinction, is a clear proof that He was supremely good, and therefore God. Yet it is undeniable, that Christ was imbued with the feelings and sympathy of a fellow man, that while He dwelt among men, He was hated and despised, endured poverty and pain, was crucified, and died on the cross; yet we look upon Him, His whole life-work, with amazement, and see in Him the manifestations of the fulness of God.

In view of the fact, that in Him was seen every divine perfection, that in Him was invested all authority in heaven and earth, wielding the sceptre of universal dominion, and all worlds moving in obedience to His will, it is beyond doubtful disputation, that He is the chief ruler of the universe, and that in Him all fulness of the Godhead dwells.

2. The fulness of Christ is revealed in His relation to the moral and spiritual world. From this standpoint the inspired apostle contemplates Christ as the all-sufficient and glorious Saviour, with a more cheerful heart and hopeful anticipations, for in this relation and work shine forth greater benevolence and beauty. In his clear and comprehensive conception of the nature, mission, and character of Christ, he believes Him to be abundantly able to devise and execute a perfect and successful plan of redemption. While to all inexperienced and finite beings, the problem of the salvation of the guilty, seemed impracticable, and in stern conflict with justice and moral law, yet, to the enlightened mind of Paul, in view of the fulness of Christ, the mystery was solved, and the fact of the salvation of believers was fully established. While it was indisputable that sin was a gross outrage in the government of God, that all moral law was immutable, that all the guilty must be punished, for moral law had no provision of mercy and pardon, yet he saw in Jesus' pierced side an outflowing stream of blood to wash away sin. In Christ, therefore, the honor and supremacy of law could be main-

tained, and the repenting sinner be saved. To do this gracious work, no one could devise a plan of redemption but God, and no one excute it but Christ. Such a system of mercy, rich in grace, and infinite in wisdom, we behold in practical operation and crystalizing into a substantial fact, in defiance of unbelief, philosophy and vaunting reason.

We will not turn aside, in this discussion, to assail the batteries of the enemies of inspired truth and the cross of Christ. We feel entirely satisfied and contented with the doctrines of the Fulness of Christ, and salvation by grace, as taught by Paul and the other apostles. Paul declares with triumphant exultation, "The righteousness of God without the law was manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time His righteousness; that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." (Rom. 3 : 21—26). Assuming the position, that Paul was divinely authorized to speak on this subject, and what he says was inspired, then the conclusion is undeniable, that God's plan of salvation is in accord with His honor, justice and law, that it will prove gloriously successful in its operations and final results. Christ can save the repenting and believing sinner. He can purify the polluted heart, remodel the ruined character, and restore the sin-stained soul to His own righteousness and true holiness. All who become the trophies of grace are created anew in Christ Jesus, and are conformed to His unstained image. In this redemptive scheme, Christ is perfectly able to root out the enmity of the carnal heart, unbelief, the resistance of human will; He is able to save the soul from its desperate disease, though its sins are red as scarlet, rankling in bitterness and

malice, and though the sinner has wandered unto the ends of the world. The strongest temptations of satan cannot bind with fetters which Christ cannot break and deliver the penitent captive. And when we are saved from sin, Christ is abundantly able to sustain and defend us, for He is our strength in weakness, we partake of His righteousness, wisdom, sanctification, and redemption. His salvation is full and glorious.

In the doctrine of the fulness of Christ, we see attributes and prerogatives which fully qualify Him to be the chief of the physical world, and Lord of all intelligent beings. He created all worlds, by His wisdom and power, for His own purpose and glory; He maintains supremacy over all without the semblance of usurpation, for this government was His own right; He keeps the machinery of the universe in motion by His will, when and where He pleases. In Him was also the fountain of grace, the effective power to work out salvation from sin, to purify the heart, refine the character, and give vigorous spiritual life, and qualify believers for heaven. Christ alone can work out a complete salvation and lift us up into a glorified state. Christ was the chief from the dead; He conquered death and spoiled the grave, and entered into His glory; therefore He is able to rescue His saints from the dominion of darkness and corruption, the foul prison-house of death, and utter the choral song of triumph, "O, grave, where is thy victory;" and then all the redeemed shall joyously, in a loud shout, respond, "Thanks be unto God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

When we reach the other shore and walk the land of pure delight, and then look back and fully realize what God has done for us and in us, how beautiful will Christ appear to us in the fulness of His perfections, grace and goodness. How full of joy the thought, that Christ was able and willing to save, and how wisely and mercifully He has accomplished the whole work. We shall then fully know what it is to be redeemed, glorified, and be forever perfect, standing firmly on truth and holiness, as on a sea of glass, with the harps of

God, among the saints of light, at rest. On each brow will shine the crown, in the hand the palm, and all robed in white. A countless company it will be, congenial in feeling and purpose, forever safe, forever happy. Shall we all be there?

ARTICLE VII.

HARTWICK SEMINARY.

By Rev. William Hull, Hudson, N. Y.

A history of the oldest Theological Seminary in the State of New York, and of the oldest theological school of the Lutheran Church in the United States, cannot fail to be of interest to the readers of the Lutheran Quarterly Review. Having, as Secretary of the Board of Trustees, recently come into possession of its records, the writer uses these documents, and others to which he has had access, to present an outline of the history of the Institution.

I. ITS FOUNDER.

Rev. John Christopher Hartwick was a native of the Dukedom of Saxa-Gotha, in the province of Thuringia, in Germany, where he was born in 1714. He was sent to this country as a missionary preacher of the Gospel, upon the petition and call of Lutheran congregations in the counties of Albany and Dutchess. In what year he came is uncertain. In 1748 he was laboring as a Lutheran pastor in New Jersey, and in the same year he participated in the organization of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania—the oldest Lutheran Synod in this country. He served Lutheran congregations in New York, Massachusetts, Maine, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. On account of personal peculiarities he remained but a short time in one place. He never married, and manifested an aversion for the other sex.

In 1754 he, with ten other persons, purchased twenty-one thousand five hundred acres of land of the Indians in Otsego County, south of Otsego Lake, on the Susquehanna river; and

which is now comprised in the town of Hartwick. Seven years passed before the grant was confirmed and letters patent issued to the purchasers by the English government. Subsequently he bought the interest of seven of the patentees, thus securing eight-elevenths of the whole. The land was divided into eleven sections and apportioned among the proprietors, which put him in possession of about sixteen thousand acres. This part of the State was then one of the border settlements, and the land had but a small pecuniary value.

In 1791, five years previous to his death, he appointed an agent, with authority to dispose of all the land except three thousand acres, which he reserved for himself; and in less than a year thirteen thousand acres were leased, in various quantities, to thirty-four different proprietors, for ten years, at an annual rent of one shilling an acre; with the privilege of purchase at the end of that time at fourteen shillings an acre. Subsequently the agent bought many of these leases, and at the end of the ten years, which reached beyond Mr. Hartwick's death, he became the full proprietor on paying the specified purchase price; so that when Mr. Hartwick died, in 1796, his landed estate was comparatively small, and all his assets amounted to only about fifteen thousand dollars.

This he put to a good use. By a will, which was proved in the Surrogates's Court of Albany County, in 1797, he appointed Hon. Jeremiah Van Rensellaer, of Albany, executor of his estate, to establish a theological and classical school on his lands in Otsego County. In a codicil, he added as executor, Rev. Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, then Speaker of the House of Representatives. He also appointed in his will Rev. John C. Kunze, of New York, and Rev. Dr. Helmuth, of Philadelphia, as Curators, who on the establishment of the Institution, in securing teachers, were "to provide proper, learned and godly persons, regularly qualified, according to the discipline of the Evangelical Church, adhering to the Augustan Confession."

He speaks in his will of the proposed institution as a "Seminarium Theologicum," and of the "Theological Faculty of the Seminarium," in which proper persons were to be

qualified for preaching the Gospel, particularly to the natives, whom he denominated Gentiles. The will, with its various codicils, shows the great eccentricity of the man. He contemplated the building of a town on his lands, to be called the New Jerusalem. He also devised one hundred acres of land, to be laid out as a glebe for an evangelical minister, to be called and appointed by the Faculty of the Seminary, and he contemplated having preaching in the Institution every day, at an hour when the community might attend morning and evening prayers.

On the 4th of June, 1799, Jeremiah Van Rensellaer, of Albany, who had been the attorney and business agent of Mr. Hartwick, qualified as an executor under the will, by accepting the trust and taking the required oath for its faithful performance; on the 19th of the same month, Rev. Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg qualified in the same manner as the other executor.

Rev. Dr. Helmuth, of Philadelphia, one of the curators or literary directors mentioned in the will, declined to act. Mr. Hartwick had placed his estate at the disposal of the executors and curators, for the execution of his pious design, to establish a thelogical school.

II. ITS ESTABLISHMENT.

The two executors and Rev. John C. Kunze, the acting curator, held their first meeting in the city of New York, on the 15th of September, 1797, and they resolved, in accordance with the will of the testator, to found a Theological and Missionary Seminary; but they were not prepared at once to decide where it should be located. Rev. Dr. John C. Kunze was appointed Literary Director, at a salary of five hundred dollars, and Rev. A. T. Braun, pastor of the Lutheran Church at Albany, his assistant, at a salary of two hundred and fifty dollars. They also appointed Rev. John Frederick Ernst to go to the patent and preach to the inhabitants, and direct the education of their children, at a salary of two hundred and fifty dollars a year and the use of one hundred acres of land.

These sums would consume all the annual income of the estate.

When it became known that the executors intended to found a theological Seminary, New York City, Rhinebeck, Albany, Schoharie, and Cooperstown, were desirous of having it located in those respective places.

Mr. Muhlenberg having died, the management depended upon Jeremiah Van Rensellaer, of Albany, and Rev. Dr. Kunze, of New York, who decided to locate the school in Albany, and to effect that purpose they entered into an agreement with the Trustees of the Lutheran Church in Albany, to administer the trust under the direction of two curators, who were to have power to nominate their successors, and one of whom must be a Lutheran minister in connection with the New York Ministerium. Dr. Kunze was at liberty to move to Albany as soon as he chose to do so, and in the meantime he was to instruct students of divinity at his residence in New York City, and beginners, intended for the ministry, were to receive their instructions at Albany from Rev. Mr. Braun.

The trustees of the Church at once began active operations. They selected a site for the proposed Seminary; issued proposals for a suitable building, and commenced the foundation. But the inhabitants of the Hartwick patent were not pleased with this arrangement. They insisted that according to the provisions of the will the Seminary must be located on the lands of the patentee, and they raised money to prosecute the executor. About the same time a resolution was introduced into the Legislature, inquiring whether the property of Mr. Hartwick had not escheated to the state for want of proper heirs.

These obstacles so discouraged the trustees of the church, that in 1808 they re-delivered the property of the Hartwick estate into the hands of Jeremiah Van Rensellaer, the only remaining representative, (Dr. Kunze, having died the previous year), and they sold the materials used in the foundation of the building.

Jeremiah Van Rensellaer died in 1810, and in his will he

appointed John G. Knauff, a trustee of the Lutheran Church in Albany, and a practicing physician, his successor as executor. Dr. Knauff at once consulted with the officers of the New York Ministerium, and resolved to establish the Seminary on the patent. In 1812 he commenced the erection of a brick building, thirty-six by forty-eight feet in size, and twenty-two feet high, besides the basement story—the whole containing fourteen rooms. He secured the services of Rev. Dr. Ernst L. Hazelius as Principal, and John A. Quitman, (afterward Major General Quitman), son of Rev. Dr. Quitman of Rhinebeck, as Assistant, and the school went into operation on the 15th of December, 1815, and during the first term the roll of students numbered forty-four. Thus nearly twenty years had rolled by since the death of the testator, and now his benevolent designs were put into execution.

III. ITS INCORPORATION.

Dr. Knauff was not willing to bear the responsibility of directing a Theological Seminary alone, and thereupon application was made to the Legislature for a charter. An act was passed on the 17th of April 1817, reciting in the preamble, that Mr. Hartwick had died seized of a considerable estate, which, "by his last will and testament he devised for the endowment of a Literary and Theological Seminary, to be established within the bounds of a tract of land, whereof he died seized, situate in the town of Hartwick, Otsego County." The preamble further states that, "one of the declared objects of the said testator was to promote the education of pious young men for the gospel ministry in the Lutheran Church, whereof he was a member"—that John G. Knauff the present trustee, had erected a commodious school building, and had employed a respectable Lutheran minister of competent talents and learning to conduct the school—that he had agreed upon a plan with the reverend Synod of the Lutheran Church for the incorporation of the Institution, and prayed the Legislature to authorize and direct the Regents of the University to grant a charter incorporating the Institution, by the name of, "The Hartwick Seminary."

The Act directs the Regents to grant an act of incorporation in the usual form of their charters, "except that the Principal of the said Seminary shall always be a Lutheran minister of good standing, and that a majority of the Trustees shall always be Lutheran clergymen and laymen, whose duty it shall be, in addition to the other branches of education to be taught in the said Seminary, to teach candidates for the gospel ministry, in the said Seminary, a regular system of Theology."

The Trustees named in the Act were Rev. Frederick H. Quitman, of Rhinebeck, Rev. Henry Möller, of Sharon, Rev. Augustus Wackerhagen, of Schoharie, Rev. Frederick G. Mayer of Albany, Leonard Fisher, of the City of New York, William C. Bouck, of Schoharie, Daniel Simmons, of Brunswick, Philip Talbert, of Albany, Rev. Daniel Nash, Nathan Davison, Samuel Crafts, and Thomas Loomis, of the town of Hartwick. It was provided that John G. Knauff should, under the direction of the Chancellor, pass over to the Trustees the full Hartwick estate; subject to such sums as the Chancellor should allow him for services, costs, charges and expenditures in the execution of his trust.

On the 30th of August, 1816, the Regents incorporated the Board, which held its first meeting in Albany on the 4th of September, 1816, and organized with Rev. Dr. Quitman the senior Trustee in the chair, and the choice of Rev. Augustus Wackerhagen as Secretary. The Trustees have by the charter power of perpetual succession, and they fill their own vacancies.

IV. ITS PROPERTY.

A schedule of the property, prepared on the 26th of August 1817, showed assets to the amount of $19,765.56, which included eighteen shares in the Western Inland Lock Navigation Company, valued at $1,500, which afterward became worthless—also fifty shares in the Second Great Western Turnpike company of the value of $1,250, which also afterward became worthless. Subtracting these, we have $17,015 as the endowment, besides the Seminary lot and building

valued at $4,275, and the Principal's house which cost $2,507.

In 1841 two wings were added to the main building, thirty-five by thirty-one feet in size, and two stories high, which contained sixteen additional rooms and cost about $1800.

In 1866 the Board of Trustees resolved to rebuild the Seminary edifice—to take down the stone wings erected in 1841—to add wings of brick three stories high, and much larger than the ones which had preceded them—to add a story to the main building, and to finish the basement for a boarding department. This was accomplished at a cost of about $21,-500, and the buildings are now ample, beautiful, and in excellent repair.

According to the last report of the Treasurer, made June 26th, 1878, the endowment was $15,527; about $1,500 less than it was in 1818, after an expenditure of over $25,000 in the intervening years on account of buildings. In 1818 the property of the Seminary, including buildings, libraries, philosophical apparatus and endowment, aggregated $26,870,31. In 1878 the same aggregated $50,359,80.

The endowment suffered so little in the large expenditure in building, in 1866, was owing to the valuable labors of Rev. William N. Scholl, D. D., in canvassing a large number of the churches soliciting aid for the Institution.

V. ITS LIBRARIES.

Rev. John Christopher Hartwick had deposited a collection of books for safe keeping with Union College, and it was not until 1823 that Mr. Bouck succeeded in getting them.

Donations to the Library are acknowledged in the minutes of the Board of Trustees from Rev. Henry Mœller, Rev. Augustus Wackerhagen, Rev. F. A. Schaeffer, Rev. Ernst L. Hazelius, Rev. Simeon Dederick, Rev. Reuben Dederick, Hon. Samuel Nelson, Dr. H. H. Muhlenberg, the New York Ministerium, Rev. Dr. Henry N. Pohlman, Hon. Sherman Page, Mrs. Rev. John Selmser, Mrs. Judge Danforth, Mrs. Rev. James Lefler and others. In 1839 the Library com-

prised 836 volumes, valued at $1,137.24—in 1878 the libraries contained 2288 volumes, valued at $4,650. The philosophical apparatus cost $780. The ladies of St. James' Church, New York City, in 1866, at the time of the rebuilding, donated $500 for an increase in the philosophical apparatus.

Rev. Dr. Scholl secured a large number of books from publishers and others for the libraries.

The gift of nearly eight hundred volumes of bound pamphlets, by Rev. Dr. Pohlman, was the most valuable gift ever received for the libraries of the Institution. It is said to be the second largest collection of the kind in the United Sates. It was the work of a lifetime to gather it, and its value can hardly be estimated. Each volume has an index, and there is a general index to the whole, prepared by the indefatigable donor.

VI. ITS SOCIETIES.

The Philophronean Society was organized in 1816, and continues until this time. Its roll of membership comprises over fifteen hundred names, and its library a choice selection of volumes. It meets weekly for debate, declamation, and composition. Another society, called the Clionian, was organized at one time, but it existed only a few years and was absorbed by the older society.

A Theological Society has been in operation for many years under the presidency of the Professor in Theology, where skeletons of sermons are submitted and discussed and short sermons delivered. It has also a valuable library.

ITS TRUSTEES.

The first Board of Trustees included clergymen who had been educated in Europe, such as Revs. Dr. Quitman, Dr. Wackerhagen, and Mœller. As these passed away, their places were filled by Alumni of the institution, such as Revs. Dr. Pohlman, Dr. Strobel, Dr. Charles A. Smith, Dr. Senderling, Jacob Berger and others. These in turn are departing, and later graduates are filling their places, such as Revs. Van Alstine, Empie, Kling, Hull, and Dr. Magee.

The following comprise the Trustees of the Institution

with their years of service: Rev. Dr. Frederick H. Quitman, 1816–1828; Rev. Augustus Wackerhagen, 1816–1845; Rev. Henry Mœller, 1816–1827; Rev. Frederick G. Mayer, 1816–1843; Leonard Fisher, 1816–1819; Hon. William C. Bouck, 1816–1859; Daniel Simmons, 1816–1836; Philip Talbert, 1816–1819; Rev. Daniel Nash, 1816–1833; Nathan Davison, 1816–1821; Samuel Crafts, 1816–1818; Thomas Loomis, 1816–1822; Farrand Stranahan, 1818–1825; Philip N. Bonesteel, 1819–1846; Rev. Peter W. Domeier, 1819–1829; Jerome Clark, 1821–1864; Araunah Metcalf, 1822–1845; Joseph D. Husbands, 1825–1833; John C. Mœller, M. D. 1827–1849; Rev. Dr. Geo. N. Lintner, 1828–1872; Rev. John D. Lawyer, 1829–1856; Robert Campbell, 1833–1848; Hon. Samuel Nelson, 1833–1874; Rev. Jacob Berger, 1836–1842; Rev. Dr. William D. Strobel, 1842–1868; Rev. Dr. Henry N. Pohlman, 1843–1874; Philip W. Engs, 1845–1864; Rev. Dr. Charles A. Smith, 1846–1856; Rev. Dr. Jacob Z. Senderling, 1846–1878; Richard Cooper, 1848–1849; Hon. John H. Prentiss, 1849–1861; Rev. Dr. William N. Scholl, 1849–1855; Hon. H. H. Van Dyck, 1855–1870; Rev. Philip Wieting, 1856–1870; Rev. James R. Kaiser, 1856–1859: Hon. Lyman Sanford, 1859, to present time; Rev. Dr. William N. Scholl to present time; Rev. Andrew Wetzel, 1862,—A. F. Ockershausen, Sen., 1864–1877; George Goertner, 1864, to present time; Ephraim Swartswout, 1868, to present time; Rev. William Hull to present time; Rev. Marcus W. Empie, 1871, to present time; Rev. Nicholas Van Alstine, 1871, to present time; Rev. Henry L. Dox, 1872–1876; William C. Davison, 1874, to present time: Rev. Dr. Irving Magee, 1875, to present time; Rev. Marcus Kling, 1876 to present time; F. V. Heydenreich, 1878, to present time.

PRESIDENTS OF THE BOARD.

Rev. Dr. Quitman, 1816–1828; Rev. Dr. Wackerhagen, 1828–1845; Hon William C. Bouck, 1845–1859; Jerome Clark, 1859–1863; Rev. Dr. Geo. A. Lintner, 1863–1872; Rev. Dr. H. N. Pohlman, 1872–1874; Hon. Lyman Sanford, 1874, to present time.

SECRETARIES OF THE BOARD.

Rev. Dr. Aug. Wackerhagen, 1816–1828; Jos. D. Husbands, 1828–1833; Robert Campbell, 1834–1848; Richard Cooper, 1848–1849; Hon. John H. Prentiss, 1849–1861; Rev. Dr. William D. Strobel, 1861–1868; A. F. Ockershausen, 1868–1877; Rev. William Hull, 1877 to present time.

TREASURERS OF BOARD.

Philip Talbert, 1816–1819; Farrand Stranahan, 1819–1824; Jerome Clark, 1824–1864; George Clark, 1864–1869; Hon. Lyman Sanford, 1869, to present time.

FINANCIAL AGENTS.

Hon. William C. Bouck, 1816–1845; Hon. Lyman Sanford, 1845 to present time.

VII. ITS FACULTY.

Principals.—Rev. Dr. Ernst L. Hazelius, from 1815–1830; Rev. Dr. George B. Miller, 1830–1839; Rev. Dr. William D. Strobel, 1840–1844; Rev. Dr. Henry I. Schmidt, 1844–1848; Rev. Dr. George B. Miller, 1848–1850; Rev. Dr. Levi Sternberg, 1851–1864; Rev. Dr. William N. Scholl, 1865–1870; Rev. T. T. Titus, 1871–1872; Rev. James Pitcher, 1872 to present time.

Professors of Theology.—Rev. Dr. E. L. Hazelius from 1816–1830; Rev. Dr. George B. Miller 1830–1839; Rev. Dr. William D. Strobel, 1840–1844; Rev. Dr George B. Miller, 1844–1869; Rev. T. T. Titus, 1871–1873: Rev. P. Bergstresser, 1874–1876; Rev. James Pitcher, 1876 to present time.

Assistant Teachers.—John A. Quitman, Henry N. Pohlman, Jacob Z. Senderling, Jacob Berger, Charles Wessels, H. Hayunga, Philip Wieting, Thomas Lape, George B. Miller, Christian B. Thümmel, Mr. Springer, Henry I. Schmidt, Levi Sternberg, John Frederick Winkler, George Neff, Henry Hawley, John J. Crafts, William E. Snyder, George H. Miller, John D. English, Irving Magee, Augustus T. Wieting, Charlotte M. Miller, Cornelius M. Myers, Alfred Hiller, Andrew Spenser, Anna J. Miller, George M. Sternberg, Henrietta Miller, John M. Hartwell, Mary R. Waters, Alansom N.

Daniels, John B. Steele, Maria Clark, James Pitcher, Adam Martin, William P. Evans, Chester H. Traver, George H. Prentice, John L. Kistler, Cora O. Barnard.

VIII. ITS ALUMNI ASSOCIATION.

In 1849 its alumni formed an association, and an annual meeting has been held since that time, at which addresses have been delivered. In 1866 the Association made extensive arrangements for the celebration of the semi-centennial anniversary of the Seminary's history. It was a large and joyous gathering. Rev. Dr. Pohlman gave an historical address, and Rev. William Hull read a poem appropriate to the occasion. The Association published a beautiful memorial volume of nearly two hundred pages, containing these, and other matter relating to the history of the Institution.

IX. CLAIMANTS.

From time to time, persons claiming to be heirs at law of John Christopher Hartwick, have threatened to commence litigation for the estate he left; but thus far there has been no action undertaken. As early as 1820, claims of this kind were made, as appears from the minutes of the Board. The President and Secretary were appointed a committee to examine these claims, and they reported at the next meeting of the Board that the claimants had not appeared. Mr. Hartwick, in his will, bequeathed one hundred acres of land to his sister's son, and this, in 1827, was conveyed by the Financial Agent, Ex-Gov. Bouck, to Rev. Mr. Siedel of Pennsylvania, who represented the heir.

The following provision in Mr. Hartwick's will left a door open for claims: "I ordain that the unsold land, mentioned in my last will, shall be let out on short leases, and that in case any of my relations of the name of Hartwig, bringing certificate from the parish minister of the parish and place they have belonged to, and also attestations of magistrates of the country, witnessing that they derive their origin from brothers of Andreas Hartwig, who the latter end of the last or the beginning of this present century, went from Seladen,

a town or village in the bishoprick of Hilderham, and afterward settled in Molschleben, a village a German mile from Gotha, shall be entitled to fifty, say fifty acres free and fifty on rent common with other tenants."

In 1829, Rev. Dr. Hazelius presented to the Board papers from parties in Germany, claiming a part of the Hartwick estate. They were referred to a committee, consisting of Messrs. Husbands, Clark, Metcalf, and Dr. Hazelius. Mr. Husbands, the secretary, made a very intelligent report, in which he contended that the Board was created by the Legislature to administer certain trusts, and that they were not a court to decide upon claims made by other parties. He concluded his report by saying: "I have searched in vain for any power conferred upon the trustees to alien and convey real estate which they hold for the benefit of the academy, to aliens in Germany, claiming under Mr. Hartwick's will. I am of the opinion that the trustees possess no such power!"

In 1843, Lewis Marquart and others of Rhinebeck, claimed one hundred acres of land under the will, and they threatened to prosecute, but the trustees rejected the claim, and they did not pursue the matter.

In 1875, an article appeared in one of the New York dailies, announcing that a man by the name of Mong had arrived in New York, representing twenty-seven heirs at law of Mr. Hartwick, and having a power of attorney from them to prosecute for the property of Mr. Hartwick, on the ground that the will was defective. It stated that Mong had retained a lawyer by the name of William H. Duryea to commence the action. The Board has not as yet heard from Mr. Mong or Mr. Duryea, and it is not probable that these alleged heirs will come into the possession of the Hartwick estate at any time in the future.

X. ITS LOCATION.

Mr. Hartwick evidently contemplated that the Seminary should be established on the lands of his patent, where he directed that a town should be laid out, and one hundred acres of land should be set apart as a glebe for the use of an

Evangelical minister, who was to be appointed by the Faculty. Morning and evening prayers at the Institution were to be attended by the people of the community. The Seminary and the town are several times alluded to in the various codicils to his will. When, therefore, there was an attempt to locate the Seminary in Albany, in 1801, the inhabitants of the patent remonstrated, and raised money to prosecute the executor, which led to the discontinuance of the attempt.

The Act passed by the legislature, April 17th, 1816, directing the Regents to incorporate the Seminary, recognizes the intention of the testator to establish it on his lands. The Act says: "Whereas the Rev. John C. Hartwick, deceased, by his last will and testament hath devised a considerable estate, for the endowment of a literary and theological seminary, *to be established within the bounds of a tract of land whereof he died seized, situated in the town of Hartwick, in the county of Otsego,*" *&c.*

In the charter of the Institution, granted by the Board of Regents, on the 13th of August, 1816, after referring to the Act authorizing the charter, they say: "Now, therefore, by virtue of the said Act, and in conformity to the provisions therein contained, we, the said Regents, have granted, ordained and declared, and by these presents do grant and declare, that a Seminary for the education of pious young men, for the gospel ministry in the Lutheran Church, in addition to other branches of education to be taught therein, be established *in the said town of Hartwick, in the county of Otsego*, to be known and distinguished by the name and style of 'The Hartwick Seminary.'"

At that time the location was tedious of access. It was before the era of railroads, and it involved a stage ride of seventy-five miles from Albany.

When afterward the New York Central Railroad was built, it reduced the stage ride, from Fort Plain to Hartwick, to thirty-one miles; and when subsequently the Albany and Susquehanna Railroad was built, the stage ride was reduced to twelve miles; and now the Cooperstown branch carries the visitor to within half a mile of the door. Otsego county

adjoins Schoharie, which has the largest number of General Synod Lutheran churches of any county in the State.

In 1833, an attempt was made to remove the Institution to the village of Cooperstown, four miles distant, where the trustees were offered, free from encumbrance, "The Cooperstown Female Seminary." An effort was made to secure an Act of the Legislature to authorize the removal, but it failed. At a subsequent time, when a removal was spoken of, Hon. Samuel Nelson, a trustee of the Institution from 1833–1874, and one of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, said, that when the effort at removal in 1833 occurred, that every lawyer in Cooperstown (the county town of Otsego county) gave it as his opinion, that the inhabitants of the town of Hartwick had such vested rights in the Institution that it could not be moved, even with the consent of the Legislature.

There was more or less talk about some other location, (which is no unusual thing in the history of institutions of learning) until 1866, when the trustees contemplated renewing and enlarging the buildings, and then they proposed that if the inhabitants of the town would raise five thousand dollars for the building fund, the question of removal should be finally settled, and that town be regarded as the permanent location of the Institution. The inhabitants of Hartwick accepted the proposition, raised and paid over the money to the Treasurer of the Board, and thus settled perpetually the question of location.

In regard to the situation of the Seminary, Rev. Dr. Charles A. Smith, who received his education there, in the "Memorial Volume" above alluded to, says: "Those who have studied most thoughtfully and intelligently the laws of influence, are aware that natural scenery has much to do with the formation of character. And, therefore, we think the literary institutions of the land, as far as may be, should be planted away from the din and materialism of the city, where the valleys smile and the mountains fling their solemn shadows. In every sphere and calling of life, we need more of the pur-

ifying, elevating power of nature's forms to shape and move the mind, and inspire it with sentiments and tastes that shall shield it from the secularizing tendency of worldly pursuits. Student life forms stronger attachments, we believe, among the everlasting hills, than amid the noise and smoke of thickly populated towns."

"There is a theology in nature which accords with the theology of the Bible, and from which the student may derive illustrations and arguments without number for the enforcement of the principles announced by inspired prophets and apostles. The study of nature is a discipline and a help for the investigation of higher truth. It imparts to the mind materials of enlarged and varied thought, and a power of presentation, not only more captivating, but also more persuasive than can be acquired by mere scholastic learning, however profound and exhaustless it may be."

"In the secluded valley that shelters Hartwick Seminary from the busy world, nature has scattered her gifts with a generous profusion. The hills wild with wood-land, or tamed by the hand of cultivation into grain-fields and pastures, recede gently, undisturbed in their repose by rugged cliffs or frowning battlements of torn rocks. The Susquehanna is bright and beautiful here as river can be, never impetuous, but purling now and then, as it runs with quickened pace through some narrow channel; or laughing in sportive leaps as it encounters a resistant stone, or the branch of some overhanging tree. Orchards and hop-fields and rich meadows interspersed with groups of trees, so harmonize and blend as to form pictures of surpassing loveliness in every direction."

XI. ITS GOVERNMENT.

As remarked above, the charter makes its trustees a self-perpetuating body, subject only to the condition that a majority of the twelve trustees shall always be Lutheran clergymen or laymen. From time to time dissatisfaction was expressed with what was termed a "close corporation." Some thought the Lutheran Synods of the State and New Jersey should have a direct voice in its government. This

led the trustees at the annual session of the board, in 1871, to pass a resolution that they would, as vacancies occurred, give the three Synods each a representation of three in the Board, with three from the patent, or at large. Since that time as vacancies have occurred, the Synod entitled to the trustee has made the nomination, which has been confirmed by the election of the person named to the Board.

XII. ITS THEOLOGICAL CHARACTER.

It was intended by its founder to be a *Theological* Institution—the Act of the Legislature authorizing its incorporation recognizes its theological character—the charter especially enjoins upon the trustees that, "they shall, in addition to the other branches of education to be taught in said Seminary, *teach candidates for the gospel ministry a regular system of theology.*" This they have done for sixty-two years, and it is not likely that in the future they will violate this provision of the charter, and the declared intention of the founder.

XIII. ITS USEFULNESS.

About one hundred Lutheran ministers have received their education, in whole or in part, within its halls. A complete list of its students from the beginning, does not exist, but they number thousands. The Philophronean Society has a complete record of its membership, numbering over fifteen hundred names. The Institution has been blessed with learned and excellent professors during its whole history. A large number of the Lutheran churches of the State of New York have been founded by ministers educated in the Institution.

The good it has accomplished, in the sixty-two years of its history, will never be realized, until the results are contemplated in the eternal world. Still the good work goes on. Within the last year, nine young men preparing for the gospel ministry, have received instruction at the hands of the two capable Lutheran clergymen who in part comprise its faculty.

Its area of territory does not justify the anticipation that it will equal in the number of its students some other of our

Lutheran institutions more centrally located as to the congregations of the Church. The General Synod is represented in the States of New York and New Jersey by about one hundred congregations, and as the territory is now so well settled, there is no probability of an increase in their number, except in the cities, where English Lutheran churches may be formed from the youth of the German congregations. The Lutheran Church in these two States needs a Literary and Theological school to meet the wants of the population, and this they have in Hartwick Seminary with its commodious buildings, its large libraries, and its capable faculty.

We cannot fail to be impressed, in considering this history with the magnitude of the good which has been accomplished on the small investment of fifteen thousand dollars. We cannot realize what mental and moral enlightenment has come from the use of that comparatively small sum. Without Hartwick Seminary, the Lutheran Church in New York would not be what it is to-day. Had the eccentric, but deeply pious, founder left his estate to his foreign relatives, all trace of it would long since have been lost; but leaving it for the mental and spiritual enlightenment of his fellowmen, it has been a perennial source of good, and to the end of time it will doubtless continue in its career of usefulness, bearing the name of its founder, whose memory will be borne to the coming ages as a benefactor of his race, and which without the humble gift he bestowed, would almost have been lost in oblivion. When it comes to the accounting, it will appear that the money placed in the hands of John Christopher Hartwick, was so faithfully administered, that our Lord will receive His own with usury. We have reason to pray God, that He would raise up many such stewards for the promotion of human good and the advancement of His kingdom.

ARTICLE VIII.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

During the summer months, as usual, the press has been occupied in meeting the demand for lighter reading, and has given us comparatively few books of the more substantial kinds and in the higher order of discussions. The list, however, contains some volumes of value.

AMERICAN.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*Salvator Mundi*, or Is Christ the Saviour of all Men, by Samuel Cox; *The Present Trial of Faith*, being Sermons preached in St. Martin's Church, Leicester, by David J. Vaughan; *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, with Notes, Comments, Maps, and Illustrations, by Rev. Lyman Abbott; *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, with Notes, critical, explanatory and practical, by Rev. H. Cowles; *Life After Death*, or Post-Mortem Accountability, by Rev. Jos. A. Seiss, D. D.; *The Atonement*, viewed as assumed divine responsibility, traced as the fact attested in divine revelation, shown to be the truth harmonizing Christian theories, and recognized as the grace realized in human experience, by Dr. G. W. Samson.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*The Principles of Light and Color*, Illus., by Edward D. Babbitt; *Annual Record of Science and Industry* for 1877, by Spencer F. Baird; *The Speaking Telephone, Talking Phonograph*, and other novelties, by Geo. B. Prescott; *How to Take Care of Our Eyes*, with Advice to Parents and Teachers in regard to the management of the eyes of children, by H. C. Angell; *Ethics, or Moral Philosophy*, by W. C. Hill.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*Artist Biographies* — Michael Angelo, by M. F. Sweester; *A Hand-Book of Politics* for 1878, being a Record of important Political Action, National and State, from July 15, 1876, to July 1, 1878, by Edw. McPherson; *Short Studies of Great Lawyers*, by Irving Browne; *Life of Madame de la Rochefoucauld*, Duchess of Doudeauville, and Founder of the Society of Nazareth, by La Rochefoucald, translated from the French; *Men of Mark*, or Heroes of English History, by Wm. Marshall; *History of the Gipsies*, with Specimens of the Gipsy language, by Walter Simson, edited with notes by Jas. Simson, 2d ed.; *Sir Walter Scott*, (English Men of Letters, ed. by J. Morley), by Richard H. Hutton.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Railroads*, their Origin and Problems, by Chas. F. Adams, Jr.; *The New Paul and Virginia*, or Positivism on an Island, by W. H. Mallock; *Through the Dark Continent*, or the Sources

of the Nile around the great Lakes of Equatorial Africa and down the river to the Atlantic Ocean, with maps and 150 illust., by Henry M. Stanley.

BRITISH.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL. — *The Gospel of Forgiveness*, discourses, by B. S. Candlish; *The Lord's Supper*, its Nature, by T. Houlston; *The Christian Code*, or Rule for the Conduct of Human Life, by H. T. J. Macnamara; *The Homilist*, Vol. V., enlarged series, edited by Dr. Thomas; *Natural Theology of the Nineteenth Century*, by J. Maclaren; *Studies on the Times of Abraham*, by G. Tomkins.

PHILOSOPHY AND SCIENCE.—*Essay on the Sacred Language, Writing, and Religion of the Parsis*, by M. Haug; *The Philosophy of Existence*, or Reality and Romance of Histories, by E. G. Kelley; *Egyptian Belief and Modern Thought*, by J. Berwick.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.—*The Gold Mines of Midian and the Ruined Midianite Cities*, by R. F. Burton; *The Approaching End of the Age* reviewed in the light of History, by H. Guinness; *Islam*, its Origin, Genius, and Mission, by J. J. Lake; *History of the Indian Mutiny*, Vol. I., by G. B. Malleson; *Early Records of British India*, a History of English Settlements in India by J. T. Wheeler; *Diderot and the Encyclopædists*, 2 vols., J. B. Mozley; *The Empires and Cities of Asia*, by A. G. Forbes.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Art and Art Industries in Japan*, by B. Alcock; *Dr. Johnson*, His Friends and His Critics, by G. B. Hill; *The Europeans in India*, etc., by E. C. P. Hull; *Moab's Patriarchal Stone*, being an Account of the Moabite Stone, by J. King.

ARTICLE IX.

HOUGHTON, OSGOOD & CO., BOSTON.
For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

Memoirs of Jean Francois Marmontel. With an Essay by William D. Howells. In two volumes. pp. 272 and 243. 1878.

These two neat volumes belong to the series of "Choice Autobiographies" which the publishers are issuing under the editorship of Mr. Howells. The series is intended for general reading, and designed to include the famous autobiographies of all languages, affording, in a compact edition, all that is best in this valuable kind of literature.

Marmontel, whose "Memoirs" of himself are worthily placed in this series, was one of the brilliant group of literary men of France during the reign of Louis XV. He was one of the 'encyclopædists,' and was personally associated with Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, D'Alembert,

Buffon, Thomas, Chastellux, Morellet, St. Lambert, Grimm, Helvetius, Raynal, D'Holbach, Galiani, and others, whose names stand out most prominently in that stirring, gay, and dissolute period. In the course of Marmontel's sketch of himself, all these men then most distinguished in literature and society, are made to appear, delineated in the clear and life-like view which his facile pen could give so well. It becomes, therefore, to a great degree, a picture of those times, and we are privileged, in it, to see the various figures move in the light of the parts they acted in the strange world which was at that day formed by the life of France, and especially of Paris. We are permitted to have a close view of the disposition, personal character, and mode of thought and life of such men as Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and their associates. We see how they lived and did their work. Though it is far from gratifying, it is yet instructive, thus to learn the vanity, the intrigues, the selfishnesses and littlenesses of men whose names attained a celebrity so historical as theirs. Their infidelity and irreligion produced no moral fruits, either in themselves or for their country soon swept by the horrors of the reign of terror, to recommend it to the reader. Few periods furnish a history so fraught with serious lessons. The author's sketches give pictures not only of the literary groups, but of the life of the times as lived by different classes, from the common ranks to the occupants of the royal palace. His account of the village home in which he spent his early life, presents a scene of innocence and virtue in striking contrast with the vices and corruption that held sway in the capital, among the nobility and in the court where the ambitious mistress, Madame Pompadour, ruled the king.

Though Marmontel wrote a great deal, and some of his productions, especially his Moral Tales, enjoyed a high popularity, the "Memoirs" here given are probably the most valuable. "Read the MEMOIRS," says Sainte-Beuve, "nothing but the Memoirs."

These volumes are very fittingly introduced to the reader's interest by Mr. Howells' judicious and enjoyable essay. They are gotten out in the "Little Classic" style, and are well worthy of a place in our libraries of choice autobiographical literature.

ARTIST BIOGRAPHIES.

Titian. pp. 160.
Raphael. pp. 153
Dürer. pp. 158.
Murillo. pp. 136.
Claude Lorraine. pp. 154. *Rembrandt.* pp. 162.
Sir Joshua Reynolds. pp. 176.
Michael Angelo. pp. 157.
Guido Reni. pp. 160.

The increasing popular interest in art and its history is made the reason, by Messrs. Houghton, Osgood & Co., for the publication of a

uniform series of biographies of the most eminent artists of mediæval and modern times. The series is meant to possess the qualities of reliability, compactness and cheapness, and the work of preparation is intrusted to Mr. M. F. Sweester.

In the nine small, but neat volumes named above, we have evidence that the work is being well done. Mr. Sweester has written with excellent judgment and taste, and given a most attractive biography of each of the artists in the list. They are brief, but full enough for satisfactory portrayal of the men and their labors, and admirably suited for popular reading. They are well adapted to increase the popular interest in art-studies, in response to which the series has been projected. A preface to each volume mentions most of the literature on the subject, and the authorities used as sources in the preparation of the account. To each is appended a list of the artist's paintings now in existence, with their dates of execution and present location, as far as can be ascertained. Only in the case of Guido the date of execution is not given. A convenient index is also added to each. Other volumes of the series are to follow. Published at the low price of fifty cents each, they will bring a great amount of knowledge concerning the history of art within the reach of many who have not hitherto been able to gratify their desires in this direction.

Memorial and Biographical Sketches. By James Freeman Clarke. pp. 434. 1878.

We have no Introduction to this volume, or anything to guide us to any knowledge of its origin or genesis. It seems to be a collection of sketches made from different sources—some of them probably from periodicals, some delivered from the pulpit, and some called forth on other occasions. The title of the volume states its character—MEMORIAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES. These sketches are nineteen in number, and the subjects of them include prominent characters in various pursuits and walks of life. Most of them contain personal recollections and anecdotes concerning individuals known to the author, but some of them, as the sketches of Washington, Shakspeare, and Rousseau, are of men of by-gone times.

The general style of these sketches is very simple and easy. There seems to be little or no effort at fine writing. They are almost conversational in their easy manner, and enlivened by frequent anecdotes and illustrative facts. They make agreeable and instructive reading. It is enough to mention among the subjects, the names of John A. Andrew, Charles Sumner, Theodore Parker, Dr. Channing, Dr. R. J. Breckenridge, George D. Prentice, Gen. William Hull, to show that the sketches embrace distinguished characters, and that they are not confined to any particular class or school. These sketches in this respect may be styled miscellaneous.

The author makes no attempt, in these sketches, to conceal his own religious sentiments, but they are not offensively thrust upon the attention of the reader. Some of the subjects belong to his own school of religion or theology, but others to the very opposite. He is not blind to merit in those who differed most widely from him. Hardly any two men were less alike in their faith and religion than R. J. Breckenridge and James Freeman Clarke, and yet he can say: "Sleep peacefully in thy grave, good soldier of the cross. We who are fighting in another camp, to which thou wert not very friendly, can see and admire generous, brave, and honest qualities, and force of intellect and character, even in an opponent; and we lay this tribute on thy coffin."

We cannot criticise these sketches separately. They differ in length and merit, but the volume as a whole cannot fail to afford pleasure and profit to the reader. We welcome it to a place in our library among the class of works to which it belongs.

The Iliad of Homer. Translated into English Blank Verse, by William Cullen Bryant. Two volumes in one. pp. xviii., 332, 355. 1878.

This translation of Homer was one of Mr. Bryant's late literary works, and a monument of his devotion to literary pursuits even in old age. It was begun in 1865, and completed in 1869. The hold which this old Greek poem continues to have on both the cultivated and popular mind, is evinced in the fact, that two translations—and these the very best—have appeared in England and this country during the present generation, and within the last fifteen years. Derby and Bryant's translations will largely supplant those of Pope and Cowper. They are closer to the original and have more of its simplicity and power.

Mr. Bryant tells us what he has endeavored to do. "I have endeavored to be strictly faithful in my rendering; to add nothing of my own, and to give the reader, so far as our language would allow, all that I found in the original." Again: "I have endeavored to preserve the simplicity of style which distinguishes the old Greek poet, who wrote for the popular ear, and according to the genius of his language, and I have chosen such English as offers no violence to the ordinary usages and structure of our own."

The objects thus aimed at, those most competent to decide will agree, the translator has accomplished with a high degree of success. Those who read this translation will have the sum and substance of Homer's wonderful story, and will feel no little of the beauty and power of the original. No translation can ever convey all the beauty of the original of this grand old epic, but it is no small merit, and deserves all

praise, that Mr. Bryant has succeeded in this so far as he has. It is not too much to say that the average student of Homer will get a better knowledge of the poem from this translation, than he will from reading it in Greek with an imperfect knowledge of the original. Many who are unable to read Greek at all can enjoy Homer in this translation.

A few specimens will show how the work is done, and how it reads. The familiar beginning is thus rendered :

"O Goddess ! sing the wrath of Pëleus' son,
Achilles ; sing the deadly wrath that brought
Woes numberless upon the Greeks, and swept
To Hades many a valiant soul, and gave
Their limbs a prey to dogs and birds of air,—
For so had Jove appointed,—from the time
When the two chiefs, Atrides, king of men,
And great Achilles, parted first as foes."

A part of the touching farewell interview between Hector and Andromache :

"So speaking, mighty Hector stretched his arms
To take the boy ; the boy shrank crying back
To his fair nurse's bosom, scared to see
His father helmeted in glittering brass,
And eying with affright the horse-hair plume
That grimly nodded from the lofty crest.
At this both parents in their fondness laughed ;
And hastily the mighty Hector took
The helmet from his brow and laid it down
Gleaming upon the ground, and, having kissed
His darling son and tossed him up in play,
Prayed thus to Jove and all the gods of heaven :—
'O Jupiter and all ye deities,
Vouchsafe that this my son may yet become
Among the Trojans eminent like me,
And nobly rule in Ilium. May they say,
'This man is greater than his father was !'
When they behold him from the battle-field
Bring back the bloody spoil of the slain foe,—
That so his mother may be glad at heart.'
So speaking, to the arms of his dear spouse
He gave the boy ; she on her fragrant breast
Received him, weeping as she smiled. The chief
Beheld, and, moved with tender pity, smoothed
Her forehead gently with his hand and said :—
'Sorrow not thus, beloved one, for me.
No living man can send me to the shades
Before my time ; no man of woman born,
Coward or brave, can shun his destiny.
But go thou home, and tend thy labors there,—
The web, the distaff,—and command thy maids
To speed the work. The cares of war pertain
To all men born in Troy, and most to me.' "

The publishers have brought out this translation in different forms,

—2 vols. Royal 8vo.; 2 vols. 16mo., Roslyn Edition; and 2 vols. in one, full gilt, 12mo.—to suit the taste of purchasers and readers. The general make up and mechanical execution of the work is in excellent style. Nothing has been left undone to make this HOMER IN ENGLISH attractive to readers.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.
[For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.]

Lectures on Mediæval Church History. Being the substance of Lectures delivered at Queen's College, London, by Richard Chenevix Trench, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. pp. x., 444. 1878.

It is hardly necessary to commend anything from the pen of archbishop Trench. His name carries with it a guarantee of ripe scholarship and sound judgment, combined with careful study and preparation in writing. His numerous volumes have been welcomed and prized by many students, in this country, as well as in England. Few English writers have found their works so promptly republished in this country as archbishop Trench.

He appears here in a somewhat, though not altogether, new character. Some of his former works had borne witness to his large acquaintance with patristic and mediæval learning. But these Lectures on Mediæval Church History were delivered "to a class of girls, at Queen's College, London." It must certainly have been a most interesting sight—and most creditable to both parties—to see the learned author lecturing to a class of girls. We admire the taste and wisdom of the lecturer and his audience; and we are deeply interested in his testimony, that, "having regard to receptive capacity, to the power of taking in, assimilating, and intelligently reproducing, what is set before them, my conviction after some experience in lecturing to the young of both sexes is, that there is no need to break the bread of knowledge smaller for young women than young men: and I did not in the original preparation of these Lectures, nor yet have I in the later revision of them, because my class was, or was assumed to be, a female one, kept anything back that I should have thought it desirable to set before young men of the same age and condition in life."

These lectures are not, and do not profess to be, a complete history of the Mediæval Church. The author thinks, and no doubt truly, that for those who do not make a special study of such subjects, it is better to seize hold of the leading points or characters, and so to dwell upon them as to obtain a tolerably clear and lasting impression. Leading points will thus be fixed in the mind, and if less has been seen and heard, more will be remembered. So, instead of a continuous history, after the more common method, our author has furnished discussions of leading events, characters, controversies, etc. They are only the mountains and valleys he has noticed, leaving the broad

and less attractive plains for others to describe. His work is therefore very different from such a one as that of Neander, covering the same period. The two might well be studied together by those who desire fuller details than are given by archbishop Trench.

The Lectures are twenty-nine in number, extending, after an introductory one "on the study of Church History," "from "The Middle Ages beginning," and "The Conversion of England," to "The Eve of the Reformation." The volume is completed with an Index.

The intelligent reader will understand, from this general statement, that these Lectures cover a period, and embrace subjects, of profoundest interest. It is the period commonly known as the "dark ages," and yet in these "dark ages" were discussed and determined some of the leading subjects which have marked our modern Christianity. On the movements of these "dark ages" these Lectures throw a good measure of light. We see the leading figures and characters acting their part in this long play of a thousand years.

It would afford us pleasure to furnish illustrations of our author's treatment of different subjects, had we room, but we cannot. We may say that the Lectures are not very long, and there is very little that is dry or tedious in the details. The subjects are handled in the clear, matter-of-fact manner which marks the good common sense of English scholars. An extract from the Lecture on "The Eucharistic Controversy," will be specially timely and interesting to our readers, and must end this notice.

"A few words before we leave this theme. It is certainly a thought of infinite sadness that this Sacrament,—the very bond of innermost communion of the faithful with their Lord, and through Him with one another,—should have thus proved so often, and, in times which this course of Lectures does not reach, will be found to prove still more, a source and spring of strife and debate, dividing Churches, and then dividing again the divided. And yet from the bitter of this thought a sweet may be extracted. There is comfort even here. How priceless it and its benefits must have been felt to be, before men would contend for it as they have done, counting it as the very apple of their eye, so that he who wounded them here wounded them in a part at once the tenderest and the most vital ; willing to set all upon the hazard, to taste all bitternesses, in exiles, in prisons, on scaffolds, at the fiery stake, for what they felt to be the truth of God in this matter. And no wonder. In the Sacraments, above all in this Sacrament, is the great abiding witness in the Church, a witness not in word only but also in act, against all merely rationalistic explanations of our relation to Christ and his to us. We are herein and hereby brought into real and direct contact with the whole Christ, and He with us ; translated out of a spiritualistic world of shadows into a true kingdom of realities.

And another comforting thought may abate the sadness with which we contemplate the endless differences with which men have learned to regard this holiest mystery of all. No doubt there can be but one truth about it, and all which is not this is wrong. But those who miss this absolute truth, we are sometimes tempted to think of them as missing the blessing of that which they underrate, or,—I will say overrate, for that is impossible—which they wrongly rate. Let us be reassured. God is greater than our hearts. Many a one who, under imperfect teaching, has come to this as no more than a commemorative rite with some vague ill-defined solemnity clinging to it, has gone away strengthened and inwardly nourished, as he only shall fully know and understand in that day when Christ shall quicken the mortal bodies of his saints. God's purposes of grace are not so lightly defeated, the ordinances which He has appointed are not so easily robbed of their blessing, as we too often assume. Let us devoutly thank Him that the condition of receiving the grace of this heavenly feast does not lie in holding what Paschasius Radbert held about it, or in denying what Paschasius Radbert held about it; in being a Berengarian, or in being an anti-Berengarian. There are things which may be too high for us, too high for our understanding, but not too high for our using and enjoying; and of such things this is one, and the greatest."

Early Rome. From the foundation of the City to its destruction by the Gauls. By W. Ihne, Ph. D., Professor at the University of Heidelberg, author of "The History of Rome," with a Map. pp. 216.

This is another volume in the valuable Series, *Epochs of Ancient History*, narrating the History of Greece and Rome, and their relations to other countries at successive epochs. Already five volumes have appeared. This Series is deservedly popular, and will do much to promote the study of History, especially among the young. The different volumes are prepared by scholars who have made a special study of their subjects, and are published in a very neat and attractive style. It is deemed unnecessary te say more to commend these volumes to our readers.

HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

(Through J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia.)

The Student's Ecclesiastical History. The History of the Christian Church during the first ten centuries from its foundation to the full establishment of the Holy Roman Empire and the Papal Power, by Philip Smith, B. A., author of the "Student's Old Testament History" and the "Student's New Testament History." With Illustrations. pp. xxxvi., 618. 1879.

It is a favorable symptom for the cause of Christianity and the

Church, that there is a demand for so many works treating of the History of the Church, and the workings of Christianity through the centuries since the Christian era. It is being felt more and more that it is the divine leaven, which has been working on, permeating and transforming human society. In spite of all that skeptics and materialists can urge, the evidence is too clear that great spiritual forces have been at work, and that what we call our advanced civilization is not so much the product of material agents as of the working of a divine Christianity. The study of the history of the Church must continue to attract more and more attention. It will not be confined to theological students and ministers of the gospel, but must become a necessity for all who would understand the great movements in the history of the world.

This work has been prepared to meet the want of a compendious history of the Christian Church, both for the student and the general reader. It is not designed to take the place of the numerous extended and learned works on this subject already in use, but to supply the lack of a compact and systematic presentation of the subject, such as many feel the need of. The author has had experience in this line of study and preparation of Histories. The "Student's Old Testament History" and the "Student's New Testament History," both published by Harper & Brothers, are from his pen, as well as the "Ancient History of the East."

It will be observed that the volume covers only the first ten centuries, and not the whole period of the History of the Church. During this period of a thousand years, it is designed to include all that especially relates to the universal Christian Church, in contrast with its national divisions. The work is divided into three Books, and they treat of the three ages, into which the whole is divided. The first age involves the first three centuries, styled the PRIMITIVE AND PERSECUTED CHURCH, the second age extends to the epoch of Pope Gregory the Great, embracing three centuries more, and the third age completes the thousand years.

The volume is unusually well supplied with the most important aids to render its use convenient and valuable. Besides the ordinary table of contents, we have nearly one hundred illustrations, a not very common feature in our Church Histories, a chronological table of nearly twenty pages, a list of Popes and Emperors, and very full Index. These are really valuable parts of the volume.

From a partial examination of the work, we have formed a favorable judgment of it for the purpose designed. The author does not profess to be free from strong convictions in regard to Christianity and the Christian Church. He writes as one who is in sympathy with his subject. This is just what candid men would expect and desire. He claims to have "studied to preserve impartiality," and we have no

good reason to doubt his candor or sincerity. It is possible, however, that in some matters affecting questions of church polity and ecclesiastical usages, the author may have been unconsciously biased in favor of methods and practices to which he has always been accustomed. The reader can readily make allowance for any seeming partialities of this kind. The author has availed himself of the latest and best authorities in preparing his work, and it will doubtless be found a most valuable addition in this department to the student and general reader, for whom especially it has been prepared.

Villages and Village Life, with Hints for their improvement, By Nathaniel Hillyer Egleston. pp. 326. 1878.

This is an interesting volume on a very interesting subject. If it does not treat of any thing very profound in science or philosophy, it does touch upon subjects most intimately connected with the health, domestic and social happiness and general welfare of the people. It may perhaps be ranged among books designed to afford pleasure in reading, but while it does this, it suggests many lessons of wisdom and instruction. At this time especially, when the overcrowded population of towns and cities raises the question of what can and must be done to meet the evil, the subject of Village Life will command attention. It is not strictly country life, but village life, of which our author treats, and yet it includes what is ordinarily understood by rural or country life.

The aim of the author is to help to a better appreciation of country life, and to make that life more nearly what its ideal should be. In the carrying out of this aim, he discusses numerous topics connected with life in the country, such as towns and country; Dullness in the country: means and occasions of social intercourse: village improvement societies, etc., etc.

Of the evils of the present tendency he says: "The country is depopulated: the city and town are overcrowded. The proper balance of population, and so the proper adjustment of life, of business, and of society, is lost. Life is not so desirable either in city or country as it otherwise would be. In the city, and largely because of the overcrowding, it is feverish and frivolous, and sometimes, ferocious. The extremes of good and evil there meet. In the country on the other hand, life is often dull and enfeebled and greatly deficient in the social element."

To make country life more attractive would be to diminish some of the evil under which society groans, and to increase the comfort and happiness of the race. The book is, by no means, a war upon city life. The author recognizes the mutual dependence of the country on the city, and of the city on the country. Such books, if read, will do good.

Annual Record of Science and Industry for 1877. Edited by Spencer F. Baird, with the assistance of Eminent Men of Science. pp. xiv., 480. 1878.

This is the seventh volume of a series commenced in 1871, and which has become a kind of necessity to all who would know the progress making in science and industry. The plan of the preparation and publication of this volume is somewhat changed from that of its predecessors.

"Heretofore," as we are told, "the 'Annual Record' has for the most part been composed, first, of a summary of scientific progress during the year; and, second, of a series of abstracts of the more important articles contained in the proceedings of learned societies and in the scientific and industrial journals of the day. With the rapid increase in the number of such papers, it has been found impossible to compress the abstracts in the limits necessarily assigned to the annual volume; and it has therefore been concluded to omit them entirely, and, by an extension of the Summaries, to furnish what will probaby better answer the purposes of the student."

This has reduced the size of the volume, but its value still remains. Whoever desire to have a compact presentation of what is going on in the busy world of science and industry, will resort to these volumes. A brief statement will hardly convey a clear idea of the discoveries and improvements making in nearly every department embraced in the limits of the present volume. About forty pages are devoted to the subject of Astronomy, nearly as much space to Geography, about thirty pages to Agriculture, and corresponding attention to other topics. Under the head of INDUSTRIAL STATISTICS there is shown a wonderful depression in the Iron Trade. The production of Anthracite Coal is placed at about twenty-one million tons, or about two millions more than in 1876.

Sir Walter Scott. By Richard H. Hutton. pp. viii., 177. 1878.

This is one of the series of "English Men of Letters," edited by John Morley. Already arrangements have been made for quite a number of the subjects, and the series will no doubt become popular. Of Scott there has been, we believe, no good life written except that by Lockhart, and this was too voluminous for general reading. Many who have admired the writings of Scott, and others who know little of his writings, but have heard of the man, will be glad to have this brief but comprehensive memoir. The author acknowledges his great indebtedness to Lockhart, and claims little merit beyond that of presenting in a readable form the most interesting features of a very wonderful character and career. The name of Scott, like that of Shakspeare, is familiar to almost every ear, and yet few know much of his life. This volume will serve to acquaint them with one whose

name has been thus familiar. The volumes of this series are brought out by the well known publishers in a neat and attractive dress. We can safely predict for the series a high degree of popularity, as they will furnish reading of a very interesting and instructive character. The greatest names in English literature, with what they have done, will be brought before this generation for its study and admiration. It will do much to cultivate the taste, as well as afford pleasure to the reading public, now happily enlarged and constantly enlarging.

J. FRED'K SMITH, PHILADELPHIA.

Lutheran Monographs. A Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession: By Charles P. Krauth, D. D., LL. D. A Question of Latinity, by Henry E. Jacobs, D. D. pp. 120. 1878.

Pamphlets of the size of this one do not ordinarily receive extended notice in the REVIEW. A few sentences are all that is usually deemed necessary or proper. But no apology need be offered, in this case, for a departure from the common rule, in bestowing on this new candidate for public favor some special attention. The character of this publication might indeed justify any respectable journal in passing it by in silence. We are not bound to take any notice of personal defamation or scurrilous abuse; but as this pamphlet has been sent to the REVIEW, thus inviting criticism, we shall not shrink from the responsibility imposed upon us. We confess to a feeling of humiliation in being called upon to perform this duty; not because of any supposed injury our character may have sustained, or discomfiture experienced in fair discussion, but to be compelled to notice the exhibition which the authors have made of themselves. Consulting our personal feelings and self-respect, we should prefer to leave it quietly to find its way to a dishonored grave. But a conviction of duty is sometimes stronger than personal feelings, and we yield ourselves to the unwelcome task.

Our readers can bear witness that the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY has not been made the vehicle of forwarding personal interests, or of seeking personal reputation; but has been open to free discussion on all the great interests of sound learning and religion; and it is hoped it will not be regarded as an abuse of privilege, or thrusting upon them an unwelcome subject, if we occupy some space in noticing this bitter personal assault, as well as this new and labored effort to bolster up a doubtful cause.

This pamphlet, as will be seen by its title, consists of two parts, by two well-known writers in the Lutheran Church—"A Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession, by Charles P. Krauth, D. D., LL. D.," and "A Question of Latinity, by Henry E. Jacobs, D. D." Another division, especially of the former part, might be conveniently made into that of the citation of authorities, and that of personal denunciation and

abuse. Of neither is there anything specially new or original. The "Chronicle" may be interesting and valuable to those who are not acquainted with the original authorities, and who may desire to see what can be presented in favor of the particular view of the author: the other part will show that Dr. Krauth has considerable ability in the way of invective and vituperation. He shows himself a greater master in invective than in logic, and whatever may be thought of his proofs and his reasoning, no one who reads this publication can doubt that he may fairly claim the palm for excelling in scurrilous abuse of his opponents. We shall make no attempt to contest with him for the honors in this field.

In some respects this pamphlet is a very remarkable one; or its authors have performed a very remarkable work in its preparation. They affect to treat with the greatest contempt the criticisms made in this REVIEW on the positions they have assumed and maintained. They speak of what we have written on the subject as if it had neither learning nor sense. And yet they have gone to the trouble of writing and publishing an hundred and twenty pages, to disprove what is so puerile, and in an attempt to pour ridicule upon the presumptuous offender. Dr. Krauth says: "HE (the writer) HAS BEEN TRYING TO SHOOT OUR PICKETS, BUT HAS NEVER COME WITHIN SIGHT OF OUR LINES." He professes to regard it with as much scorn as when the great Goliath said, "AM I A DOG, THAT THOU COMEST TO ME WITH STAVES?" And yet he seems to have been so alarmed or disturbed at this picket firing, that he summoned to his support his trusted aid-de-camp, Dr. Jacobs, and they have occupied themselves nearly six months in strengthening their lines, and then, with their works fairly bristling with the sight of the names of old Lutheran heroes, and a huge display of Latinity, drawn from the magazines of grammars, lexicons, and approved manuals, they have boldly ventured to fire in reply this hundred and twenty pounder. It is quite strange that such confident and courageous soldiers, so securely entrenched within their lines, should have deemed it worth while to return mere picket-firing after this fashion. That our readers may have some idea of the dignified character and classic English of the rhetorical part of this pamphlet, we transcribe a brief extract for their benefit.

"Dr. Brown writes habitually in a vein which excludes him from all right to courtesy. Years ago we discovered that to an obstinacy which declined to learn and an ignorance which made him incapable of teaching, he added a dishonesty in citation and a coarseness of imputation which deprived him of all right to notice; and we ceased to notice him. We hoped that the Diet would mark the beginning of a new era with him; but his review shows that he is beyond change. If he thought that the crime of being a member of an ecclesiastical body, which he helped to drive from the one of which he is a special incubus, absolved him from the duty of decency to ourselves, he might at least have treated with the ordinary courtesy which one who claims to be a

gentleman extends to another, Dr. Conrad, who has long been one of the greatest powers in the General Synod, and who has done as much to build up the Seminary which feeds Dr. Brown as Dr. Brown has done to pull it down."

Comment on such language is deemed unnecessary. Coming from a Professor in a Theological Seminary, and a Vice-Provost in the University of Pennsylvania, it is sincerely to be hoped that the students in neither of these Institutions will be ambitious to imitate their distinguished professor.

Besides "the ordinary courtesy which one who claims to be a gentleman extends to another," there were perhaps special reasons why Dr. Krauth should have hesitated to embark in this wholesale and bitter denunciation. We happen both of us to be professors in Theological Seminaries, engaged in the same general work of the Church. The Seminary in which Dr. Krauth serves was established in opposition to that of the General Synod, in which it is our privilege to labor. Chivalry, if not Christianity, would suggest an honorable bearing towards a co-laborer, in a common cause, however differing in their views on some points. But almost from the day of our election and entrance upon duty in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod, Dr. Krauth has continued to heap abuse on us and the Seminary. For no cause that we know of, except that the Board of Directors were pleased to call us to this post of duty and that we did not feel free to decline it—and this in Dr. Krauth's judgment seems to have been an unpardonable offence—we have been subjected to this treatment. The presence of his own aged father, as professor in the Seminary, did not restrain him from his attacks upon the Institution, and his attempts to "pull it down;" and when unable longer to hold with comfort a pen, at the request of that venerable man, we had to defend the Seminary against these unnatural assaults from such a source. It is with no gratification that we record such things, but we do not regard it as a Christian duty to endure such abuse, without letting our readers know it is but a repetition of what Dr. Krauth has been doing for years.

We are glad that Dr. Krauth has done this tardy justice to the merits of Dr. Conrad. It may be some atonement for his treatment of him through many former years. No one can appreciate more highly than ourselves the generous and self-sacrificing labors of Dr. Conrad in behalf of the General Synod, and its Theological Seminary; nor have we any serious apprehensions that this attempt to alienate him from the objects of his life-long devotion will be very successful. We are willing to leave to the generosity and true nobility of Dr. Conrad's nature, to determine who has done him the wrong, if any has been done, in this controversy—the man who, boasting his great reputation and careful scholarship, by false assurances led him to

make and afterwards persist in a blunder, or one who pointed out that blunder with the real and responsible author of it. Dr. Krauth owes to Dr. Conrad the humblest apology for having thus deceived and betrayed him into error, even when cautioned of his danger, instead of attempting, by abuse, to divert attention from his own misconduct. If Dr. Conrad deems that we have, in any way, done him a wrong or injustice, we stand ready to apologize to him—but it is simply an impertinence for Dr. Krauth to intermeddle between Dr. Conrad and ourselves, and attempt to tell his readers what we owe to each other as gentlemen. We may not choose to accept Dr. Krauth, especially since this last display of his taste, as an instructor in the department of gentlemanly deportment. We claim no special merit for ourselves, beyond a simple endeavor to do our duty; but we are happy to inform all who care to know the truth, that, in spite of Dr. Krauth's slanderous accusations, the Theological Seminary of the General Synod has never enjoyed a greater measure of prosperity than for the past ten years, during which it has been our privilege to labor in its behalf in training young men for the ministry of the Gospel.

We regret that Dr. Jacobs has given his name to a publication so unworthy of his position and character. He may consider himself justified in the part he has taken, by our reference to him in the April number of the REVIEW. But we submit that that brief reference was not only respectful, but eminently courteous, and whether his treatment of us is so or not, we are willing to leave to all impartial judges. It is true that his own part of this pamphlet is free from anything abusive, but his hearty endorsement of Dr. Krauth's part as a "complete vindication," as well as uniting in this joint publication, makes him responsible for his full share of the work. Dr. Jacobs has before him, we hope, many years of honorable and useful service in the Church, but such efforts will not add to his reputation as a scholar or a divine. If his life is spared, he may find cause to regret that he has allowed himself to be used in the effort to blacken the reputation of one who has always maintained to him the most friendly attitude.

So far as we are personally concerned, we do not wish to be understood as at all objecting to the style of discussion adopted by Drs. Krauth and Jacobs. They have a right to choose their own weapons of attack and defence. If a man in a controversy thinks he can use a bludgeon with more effect than he can arguments, he is at liberty to make his choice. Others will judge of his character as a disputant. If these two Doctors prefer the style common to a very different class of men, they are welcome to their method and their glory. Dr. Krauth's temper and manner, in this discussion, are so fitly described by Archbishop Trench, in words applied to another, that we are tempted to quote them. "He scolds like an angry woman. * * He cannot

conceive of any opposing or even disagreeing with him, except as impelled to this by ignorance, or dishonesty, or personal malice."

This pamphlet contains a number of personal matters, which must claim a brief attention before we proceed to review the real points at issue in the discussion. Dr. Krauth labors to make the impression, that we have been guilty of unfairness in the speeches we furnished for publication in the proceedings of the Diet—presenting "a new issue," a "FICTITIOUS AFTER-THOUGHT"—and of violating our honor in making use of the proof of a forth-coming book which we were permitted to see in strict confidence. To us it is surprising that the Secretary of the late Diet, Dr. Jacobs, could allow his name to go on a publication containing such charges. All of the essays and speeches to which we made any reply, were voluntarily submitted to us by the Secretary, without our asking. Some of them were found to be so altered as to require a modification, or complete change, of what we said in the Diet. Dr. Conrad's essay, according to Dr. Krauth himself, was revised, and in a large measure re-written. Under the guidance of Dr. Krauth, and relying on his authorities, Dr. Conrad presented the matter at issue quite differently from what he had done in the Diet. Our challenge we made to suit the altered statement of Dr. Conrad, and Dr. Krauth saw it; and he and Dr. Conrad made their reply. In this case, as in every other in these proceedings, we read to Dr. Jacobs, in his own study, every word that we had written, and requested him to make objection, if in anything we had gone beyond the bounds of propriety or the facts in the case. Over and over was Dr. Jacobs asked to make any objections. He not only endorsed what we wrote as fair and truthful, but assured us that he would allow us wider liberty if we chose to use it. Not one word from us went into print in those proceedings without the expressed assent and endorsement of Dr. Jacobs. There was no "STRICT CONFIDENCE" at all in seeing the proof. We were requested to see it, and part of it, and the very part in question, we were told we could take and need not return, and it is now in a pigeon-hole on our study table. So much did we violate our honor, and we are willing that others shall judge with whom the "question of honor" properly belongs.

Along with this may be mentioned the repetition of stale slanders attempted a dozen years ago. Dr. Krauth seems to have forgotten what he ought to have remembered. He repeats his statement about the translation of EXHIBEANTUR, although he was informed at the time that the translation was not ours, but was appropriated from the current English translation of the Book of Concord, as revised by Drs. C. F. Schæffer, C. P. Krauth, Sen., and others. Both in regard to this and the translation of 'begiessen,' if we were to imitate Dr. Krauth. we would say that "he deliberately writes what he knows to be untrue."

Even if the translation of EXHIBEANTUR had been our own, a small degree of modesty would have constrained silence on the part of one, who had most ludicrously blundered, and kept on blundering, in his "CAREFULLY REVISED" translation of a plain sentence in the Preface to the Augsburg Confession, as prepared for Dr. Schaff's great work—"The Creeds of Christendom." When Dr. Krauth has acquired a mastery of Latin sufficient to preserve him from mistaking a future for a past tense, and to distinguish between the verbs "comparo" and "compareo," he can better afford to attempt sneering at the alleged errors of others. Meanwhile we advise him, when tempted to take on such airs, to just remember that "carefully revised" translation of his, that we happen to know so chagrined his friend Dr. Schaff, as well as called forth the biting criticism of that "scurrilous Romish writer," in the "American Catholic Quarterly Review."

Dr. Krauth has been successful in detecting a slip in our article in the April number of the REVIEW, and it seems to have afforded him infinite merriment. He plays with it through several pages, and illustrates the character of a great and learned critic. We spoke of the suite of the Elector, not thinking of excluding the Elector himself, as embracing more than half of the princes who signed the Augsburg Confession. We unhesitatingly admit the blunder. Of course the suite of the Elector did not include the Elector, and of course three are not more than the half of seven. But as in our mind we included the Elector, and the Elector with his suite made four of the princes, this is more than half of seven. We stand corrected, and acknowledge our indebtedness to Dr. Krauth for pointing out our error, nor would we deprive him of the gain he seeks to make out of so small capital. We will not even avail ourselves of the plea which he puts in for some of his own most unfortunate blunders—"Mental preoccupation, temporary languor from overstrained attention, or loss of rest, and other causes of a similar nature, account for the familiar fact that great scholars have made mistakes of which they were heartily ashamed, mistakes which an intelligent school-boy put upon his guard, could not make, and with his attention quickened, would at once detect." We will not, we repeat, avail ourselves of this plea which Dr. Krauth puts in on behalf of "great scholars" like himself. He may ascribe it to our invincible "ignorance," which does not know that a man is not included in his own suite, and that three is not more than the half of seven. It is a happy thing for Dr. Krauth that he was able to detect this blunder. We have no defence to offer. We know that sometimes a man's family is made to include himself, and we recently noticed one of our most careful and vigorous newspaper editors making a similar blunder. It might even be said that the Greeks had a common idiom somewhat of this character. But we were not wri-

ting Greek, and we confess our careless use of the English language in this case.

Dr. Krauth, with a grandeur of thought that spurns little things, has detected another serious error in our article. He quietly informs his readers that we probably mean by "where—from," what writers of English usually express by the word "whence." The Doctor is no doubt right, according to the best old English authorities, though he exposed himself to the ridicule of a reviewer sometime since for his pretences in this particular. It may abate the shock to his keen sense of any violation of the good old English, as well as mitigate the heinousness of our offending, to let him know that this form of expression has become rather common in colloquial English, and is not unknown even in respectable journals. Since this sagacious criticism, we have noticed it in two leading papers in the city of Philadelphia—the "Press," and the "National Baptist"—and could furnish scores of illustrations from them and other publications. Still, we are glad, that Dr. Krauth has called attention to this alleged inelegance of style, as it shows that however overstrained he was, when preparing his own work, leading him sadly to blunder both in translations and dates, he now has leisure to attend to the smallest matters.

Dr. Jacobs presents us as charging him with 'going out of the way to attack the REVIEW.' We are not aware of having made any such charge. He gives his own version of the matter, and without questioning its truthfulness, we may be permitted to present ours. After the publication of the "Conservative Reformation," and a tolerably lengthy notice of it, in the following July number of the REVIEW, Dr. Jacobs did proffer to one of the Editors of that Quarterly a review of the work, notwithstanding the "great care and anxiety," to which he refers. This proffer was deliberately considered by the editors, and Dr. Jacobs was informed, in substance, that the REVIEW would be freely open to him for an article on any subject discussed in the 'Conservative Reformation, and that he could draw freely upon that work in his discussion of it, but that the department of book reviewing was in the hands of the editors, and that it had already been attended to. He was understood at the time to acquiesce in the justness of the decision. His review appeared in the October number of the 'Mercersburg Review,' and was spoken of at the time as designed to offset some of the strictures in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY. Dr. Jacobs says he has "no recollection whatever of any strictures of the REVIEW which were in mind, when the notice referred to was written." We accept his statement as true, according to his "recollection;" but are constrained to add, that it looks like what he calls "a mere quibble," when he informs his readers that in 'his copy he finds the pages containing the strictures uncut; but

confesses he was "not unacquainted" with the strictures, from other sources.

So far as we have noticed, there is but a single point in which Drs. Krauth and Jacobs seem to differ—and this confessedly a point of very little importance. It is entirely personal and concerns their estimate of ourselves. Dr. Krauth's favorite charge is that of "IGNORANCE." He seems never to tire in repeating the word, and it serves both the lack of proof and to meet every objection or difficulty on his part. He would hardly know what to do had he not this ready relief. But Dr. Jacobs is pleased to speak of us as a "SCHOLAR OF ACKNOWLEDGED INTELLIGENCE." It may puzzle the readers of this "Lutheran Monograph" which to believe, Dr. Krauth or Dr. Jacobs. Possibly Dr. Jacobs intends his to be understood ironically, as he aims to be ironical in his criticism; or, possibly, on "a review of the entire subject," he may be "led to a detection of the error," and thus harmonize his view with that of Dr. Krauth. We have pointed out the apparent discrepancy that our readers may have the benefit of both views. Of course it is to us immaterial which of these authorities they may prefer to follow.

Having disposed of these personal matters, and to which perhaps too much time and space have been given, we now come to the more important part of this pamphlet—the proof it furnishes in support of Dr. Krauth's theory.

We have searched in vain through these one hundred and twenty pages for any additional proof or new arguments. The old matter is rehashed, with a prodigious display of authorities that prove just nothing to the point, and a discussion of LATINITY which shows that Dr. Jacobs can more readily compile from grammars and dictionaries, than he can discover the plainest matters of fact in the case.

So far as Melanchthon's letter of May 22d is concerned, it seems scarcely worth while to recur to it again, and we would not, did not Dr. Krauth's persistence make it necessary. We showed in the April number of the REVIEW, that even if this letter had been sent to Luther, and received by him, and an answer returned, it would not at all prove what is claimed—not even a second sending of the Augsburg Confession. All that Melanchthon requests Luther to do, is to run over the ARTICULOS FIDEI, article of faith, and expressly excepts the other part of the Confession from his examination at that time—saying, "the remaining part (reliqua) we will treat as we may be able." The ARTICULOS FIDEI, which Melanchthon asks Luther to run over, according to Dr. Krauth, are about "in the ratio of six to twenty-six;" so that it is less than one fourth of the whole Confession that Luther is requested to re-examine. How this proves even a sending of THE CONFESSION—the whole Confession—much less, as has been affirmed, 'Luther's unqualified approval of it,' must puzzle even Dr.

Krauth to show. If some one were asked to read over the New Testament, would that prove that the whole Bible had been sent, read, and approved? Or if some one were requested to run over the Pentateuch, would this prove the sending of the whole of the Old Testament; and that it was examined and returned with approval? And yet this is substantially the logic employed to prove a second sending of the Confession to Luther, and his examination of it—a request of Melanchthon that he would run over less than one fourth of it, and that one fourth a separate and distinct part from the remaining portion. On such proof Dr. Krauth proposes to annihilate all objections, and even brand with "complete ignorance and effrontery" the refusal to accept his "demonstration."

But Dr. Krauth has not even proved, as he alleges, the "second SENDING" by Melanchthon and the "second reception" by Luther, prior to the Diet of Augsburg. The only additional evidence adduced, we believe, is the letter of Luther to Melanchthon on the 29th of June, four days after the Diet. In this he refers to "THE PICTURE OF VIENNA," which Melancthon, in his letter of May 22d, wrote about sending. But if this letter of Luther, June 29th, proves so much, another letter of Melanchthon, still four days later, July 3d, will prove more. Melanchthon in this letter, written to Veit Dietrich, who was with Luther, wants to know whether Luther has received this picture —utrum Doctor acceperit depictam Viennæ obsidionem, quam ei misi. He expresses his suspicion that the messenger may have sold it: suspicor nuncium vendisse. Now it is plain, beyond a doubt, that up to this time, July 3d, eight days after the presentation of the Confession at the Diet, Melanchthon knew nothing of Luther's having received the picture: and this is strong evidence that he at least had no knowledge of Luther's receiving the letter of the 22d of May, in which he tells Luther that he is sending him this picture. Dr. Krauth indeed tells us, that "Luther often does not answer the particular points of a letter." This is a very easy way of explaining his silence for six weeks, if he received that letter "without any serious delay." Dr. Krauth says: "HIS SILENCE WAS HIS ANSWER!" That is Dr. Krauth's way of meeting a difficulty. He says indeed, that "Dr. Brown admits the sending." We admit nothing of the kind, simply because we lack the evidence on which to rest a satisfactory belief. This letter of Melanchthon is entirely insufficient to prove the point for which it is cited.

It is plain that the whole case of a further sending the Confession to Luther, before the Diet, rests upon this passage of Melanchthon. Its importance is insisted on by both Dr. Krauth and Dr. Jacobs, and they have made use of every endeavor to support their interpretation of Melanchthon's language. They assume that Melanchthon gave it

as a kind of dying testimony for this very purpose, and that every word must be viewed as testimony in a court of inquiry. Dr. Jacobs devotes thirty pages of criticism to show that Dr. Krauth has hit upon the true and only meaning. We shall not ask our readers to traverse this dreary wilderness of learned criticism. By the process Dr. Jacobs has employed, almost any thing can be proved in regard to the meaning of Latin words. Happily, in this case, we can submit their interpretation to another ordeal, and, without so much learned display, show its absurdity and utter untenability. Dr. Jacobs has treated his readers to a display of learned authorities, and cited some of the canons of hermeneutics. There is one very simple canon which he has forgotten or overlooked—although it is a fundamental one—the canon of common sense. We propose to subject this translation and learned criticism to this test, and to show that they will not stand such an ordeal.

Dr. Jacobs insists that "de singulis sententiis" must here mean "sentence by sentence," or as he explains, "concerning sentence by sentence," or "concerning the sentences one at a time," or "concerning each sentence taken separately." To thus sustain Dr. Krauth, he is compelled to confess his own error in translating the words a year ago. To confess an error when convinced of it, marks a candid mind, but a confession of error may be evidence of something else, and our readers must judge for themselves in this case.

Dr. Jacobs feels constrained to "beg pardon for referring to a very elementary principle" in discussing the construction of DISPUTATUM EST. The design of this is very manifest—to suggest that "critics of the school which the article in the REVIEW represents," know nothing beyond the elements of Latin Grammar! It would have been well for Dr. Jacobs, if he had either not made such a suggestion, or had not in himself furnished such an illustration of this school of critics. Could anything be more "elementary," than when Dr. Jacobs parades from the dictionary the etymology of DISPUTO, to determine its meaning? For the benefit of beginners in Latin we give it: "DIS No. II. A., 3 b.) and PUTO (No. II. a.)" "PUTO—clear up, set in. order, arrange, settle, adjust." "DIS. of computation SEVERALLY, ONE AFTER ANOTHER ...." Now this is to settle the meaning of the word in the middle of the sixteenth century, after it had been in use two thousand years. We quote for the benefit of our critic a very simple and plain statement, made by Dr. S. S. Haldeman, an acknowledged authority, a short time ago in a newspaper article. "A mistake is often made in taking the etymology of a word as a guide to its current meaning." This is too obvious to need illustrating, and yet Dr. Jacobs has, in his very elementary criticism, overlooked so simple a principle. He further says: "We frankly acknowledge that at first we also had some doubt concerning the legitimacy of the words:

"and determined" that follow "discussed." But armed with grammars and lexicons, he goes bravely to work, soon puts to flight his "doubt," and reaches the desired conclusion. It might be interesting to try this meaning by a few familiar passages of Melanchthon's own Latin, instead of that from grammars and lexicons. In the well known letter of May 22, Melanchthon says: Nunc de potestate clavium etiam disputo—"I am just now discussing [and determining upon] the Power of the Keys." In two letters, June 19th, to which we shall have occasion to refer again, he uses DISPUTATUM EST, in regard to the forbidding of the Protestant theologians to preach. De ea re toto triduo disputatum est: Hac de re postea diebus tribus disputatum est: "concerning this matter they discussed [and determined upon] three whole days." It is a little in the way of this interpretation of Melanchthon's Latin, that in both these cases he expressly adds, that afterwards, "it was determined," decursum est eo. In the letter of June 11th, Melanchthon uses disputatio, as prolixas disputationes, and it would be simply amusing to give it the meaning of these critics.

One other special point of Dr. Jacobs' criticism we must notice. He says: "The more we consider the objection thus made concerning the TOTA, the more are we astonished that it should ever have been raised by a scholar of the acknowledged intelligence of the critic." The astonishment of Dr. Jacobs cannot be greater than our own, that he should thus attempt to support Dr. Krauth's argument based on his translation of TOTA. Dr. Krauth's argument required a certain use of TOTA; we denied that this meaning was necessary, or even the strict meaning of the word, and this excites the astonishment of our critic. We choose to meet his astonishment by the expression of our own. But he is not satisfied with this. He supposes that we meant to make an attack somewhere, and mistook the word—"FORMA was marked as the vulnerable point, and then by some inexplicable confusion the point of attack was transferred to the TOTA." Now we are compelled to tell Dr. Jacobs plainly, that we do not know of anything in his superior talents or attainments that warrants him in any such imputations to us. He must not suppose that because Dr. Krauth allows himself to indulge so freely in the charge of "ignorance," and flatters him with "having a distinguished reputation as a Latin scholar," that therefore he can indulge in such criticisms with impunity. If he desires illustrations of "inexplicable confusion" in dealing with Latin, we will furnish enough from his own translations. At present we forbear, but admonish Dr. Jacobs that it may not be wise for him to indulge in that style of criticism. We have no desire to depreciate his attainments in Latin, but they are not such as to warrant the liberties he has ventured to take, and we cannot help distinctly telling him so.

We now submit their translation and exposition to the proposed ordeal. It is alleged that according to Melanchthon's Latin, the Confession was "discussed and determined upon in regular course, sentence by sentence," or as Dr. Jacobs explains, "each sentence taken separately,"—"a minute analysis of the entire document, taking into the account, one after another, all its items, together with the reasons that could be cited on both sides, in order to attain a clear and fixed form."

Now it is very obvious that such a process would require time. It took two full hours to read the Confession, without any delays or interruptions. According to the ordinary numbering of sections or paragraphs in the Augsburg Confession, there are four hundred and forty. The number of sentences is somewhat less. Separate and full discussion, such as is claimed, on each sentence, would take at the very least some days, if not weeks. It could not be done in a few hours, for it took two hours simply to read the Confession without discussion. Well, when was this done? We now ask our readers to consider a plain simple question of facts, apart from any strained interpretation of words.

Dr. Krauth cites authority to show that the German Formula was submitted to the Orders, "JUNE 14th, AND AFTER THIS COMES THE DISCUSSION MENTIONED BY MELANCHTHON." (p. 61). This will serve as a starting point. The Princes and others met the next morning, June 15th, at 5 o'clock, to arrange for the reception of the Emperor, who was to enter Augsburg that day. After the necessary preparation, they proceeded out of the city to meet him, and in the evening all marched into the city in grand procession. From five o'clock in the morning until near midnight, they were thus engaged on the 15th. This is an historical fact that will not be disputed. This was Wednesday. Almost immediaiely on entering the city, the Emperor interdicted the preaching by the Protestant theologians. This produced great excitement on the Protestant side. The Emperor also demanded that they should join next day, the 16th, in celebrating the festival of Corpus Christi. The excitement was so great that some were called up during the night to confer about it. Early next morning the Princes met, the Elector, being too unwell to attend, was represented by his son John Frederick. They determined that they would not be present in the procession of Corpus Christi. For three whole days they now discuss the subject of preaching by the Protestant theologians. This was the 16th, 17th, and 18th, or Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. Of this we have the most definite and positive proof. We have two letters of Melanchthon, (Corp. Ref. II., 730, 731), one to Myconius and the other to Luther, written on the 19th. In the former he writes: De ea re toto triduo disputatum est—as Drs. Krauth and Jacobs claim, they discussed and determined upon this matter three WHOLE or COMPLETE days. In the latter nearly the

same: Hac de re postea diebus tribus disputatum est. Neque enim statim desierunt nostri concionari. Tandem post longam decertationem decursum est eo, etc. There is also a letter of Brentius to Isenmann on the same day, and one from the Nuremberg legates to the Senate of Nuremberg. From these documents, especially from the letters of Melanchthon, we learn that there had been no time for any discussion of the Confession between the 15th and 19th of June. The whole of these four days, the 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th, had been fully occupied with other matters. The 19th was Sunday. Now here we might safely rest the whole case, without further proof or argument; as between Sunday, the 19th, and Saturday the 25th, the day on which the Confession was read in the Diet, there was absolutely not time for this minute discussion, "sentence by sentence," and the sending of the Confession to Luther, his reading it and writing to the Princes his approval—all before its presentation. Dr. Krauth, several times in his discussion, makes four days the time for a courier to pass between Augsburg and Coburg, or eight days to go and come; and there is less than six days between Sunday the 19th and the time of the reading of the Confession. Where is the time for this minute, protracted discussion and determining upon the Confession, "sentence by sentence," between the 14th and the 25th. We have shown that up to the 19th there was absolutely no time for this discussion, and that after that, the period was too short, even if there were nothing in the way.

But there are still additional difficulties to be considered. The Diet was formally opened on Monday the 20th, and this now occupied most of the time. Day by day grave and exciting matters engaged their attention. On Wednesday, the 22d, the Emperor demanded that the Confession be presented on Friday the 24th. The Protestant Princes begged for time, as it was not yet ready and they had no clean copy. The Emperor refused the time requested, and the Princes met on the 23d, read over the Confession, and signed it. So that between the 18th, and the signing of the Confession, were only four days. Or, allowing only six days, two less than the ordinary time, according to Dr. Krauth, for sending the Confession and getting it back again, before its presentation, with no time for Luther to examine it, and it must have been sent as early as Sunday the 19th. But between the 14th and 19th there was no time, as has been shown, for this discussion of Dr. Krauth and Dr. Jacobs. So that unless Dr. Jacobs can by a miracle create time or annihilate space, it is certain that the time was too short, and the distance too great, to admit of that "sentence by sentence" 'discussion and determining upon,' and that sending of the Confession afterwards to Luther, and his reading it, and writing to the Princes his approval. We believe it is a demonstrable, and demonstrated, impossibility to have been done, as Dr. Krauth main-

tains, between the 14th and the 25th of June: and Dr. Jacobs' thirty pages of LATINITY, in the presence of stern facts, are like so much chaff before the wind. Words may be manipulated to mean almost anything, but facts are not so easily managed. This plain statement of facts, sustained as they are by unquestionable proofs, ought to satisfy any candid mind as to this minute and prolonged discussion of the Confession, between the 14th and 19th of June, and the sending of it to Luther, and its return after a re-examination, before the reading of it at the Diet, June 25th.

But we have other proofs to show the untenability of this theory.

The Confession was not yet finished on the 19th: that is, "COMPLETE" or "FINISHED" in the sense that these critics insist on assigning to "TOTA." We have the writing of the legates of Nuremberg, (Corp. Ref. II. 728) to prove this. Bretschneider, who has carefully traced the successive stages in the completion of the Confession, in the 26th Volume of the Corpus Reformatorum, expressly says: Etiam d. 19. Jun. Confessio nondum fuit finita, etc.—"Even on the 19th day of June the Confession was not completed." In proof of his statement he cites this writing of the Nuremburg legates of June 19th. We have thus the express testimony of these legates, on the ground, that the Confession was not finished on the 19th, testimony that cannot be questioned—and after the 19th, there was not time to complete and send it to Luther and have it back before the 25th, or in time for the Diet. This testimony of the Confession not being finished on the 19th, let it be observed, is that of men living at the time, and not as the bulk of Dr. Krauth's witnesses, men who lived from one to three centuries later, and whose testimony is simply their individual opinions. If it be true, as these Nuremberg legates declare, and Bretschneider repeats, with additional proof, (Corp. Ref. XXVI., 209), that the Confession was not finished on the 19th of June,then it is clear again, that the time is too short to finish it, and send it to Luther, and get his answer, unless all this could be done in a little more than six day. But as we know from other testimony already given, there had yet been no time for that discussion, so much insisted on by Dr. Krauth, and by Dr. Jacobs in his ponderous Latinity, the argument is conclusive against their interpretation and application of Melanchthon's words. It may be a pity thus to spoil Dr. Krauth's wonderful array of authorities, and Dr. Jacobs' equally wonderful Latinity, but we venture to say that it is a clear case of a reductio ad absurdum.

Besides what has been proved by testimony that cannot be impeached or set aside, we have very strong collateral evidence against the theory of Drs. Krauth and Jacobs, in interpreting Melanchthon's Latin. Melanchthon may be presumed to be reasonably self-consistent, or not to have meant in this passage what would present himself as acting elsewhere an almost childish and silly part. The Confession was read

before the Diet on the 25th of June. The very next day, Melanchthon sends it to Luther to be read: and the next day already, the 27th, writes to Veit Dietrich, asking to know Luther's opinion about it—Doctoris judicium mihi rescribe. With manifest anxiety and impatience to know how Luther would like it, he writes again to Veit Dietrich, only three days later, June 30th, and says, "I desire to know what the Doctor thinks of the Confession"—Scire cupio * * Doctor * * judicaverit περὶ τῆς απολογίας. Dr. Krauth says: "That Melanchthon should think it necessary to ask Luther, in a letter which could not reach him earlier than May 26th, to run over an urgent document which had been sent him May 11, is preposterous." He thinks "it is hardly necessary to point out the intrinsic absurdity of the supposition" that Melanchthon would ask Luther to look over the same Confession so soon. Would it not be equally "preposterous," and prove alike "intrinsic absurdity," for Melanchthon to show so much anxiety, and to write twice in a few days, to know Luther's judgment of the Confession, if Luther, after it was entirely completed, and just before its presentation in the Diet, had written "to the Princes, that he had both read the (Dr. Krauth says, "literally this—hanc") Confession, and approved it?" Is it reasonable that Melanchthon would have thus written, if he knew that Luther had signified his approval in writing only a few days before? Or is it likely that Melanchthon could have meant to write in 1560, what would have proved his conduct so preposterous and absurd in 1530? We are willing now to leave this QUESTION OF LATINITY, with the interpretation and application of Melanchthon's language, to the intelligence and candor of our readers.

After all the pretentious boasting of Dr. Krauth, as to what he and Dr. Jacobs have achieved in this "Lutheran Monograph," piling proof upon proof, and literally overwhelming all opposition, until he affects to treat with scornful pity and contempt both ourselves and the "Lutheran and Missionary," he is compelled, before closing, to make a humiliating confession of the utter weakness of his case—a most pitiable acknowledgment that he has not one particle of actual testimony to prove what he has been so elaborately and boastfully attempting. He says: "There may have been a special arrangement by which Luther was reached and heard from in this particular crisis, with an extraordinary degree of promptness. Such a communication would of course be guarded with special caution!!" "OF COURSE," and there might have been a special train, or the whole text of the Confession might have been telegraphed to Luther. The only difficulty is, we have no evidence of railroads or telegraphs at that time, and just as little evidence of any "special arrangement" for "an extraordinary degree of promptness."

Again he says: "In sending it to Luther after the gathering of the

Estates, with the Emperor, special precautions could be employed. It would not go openly with the ordinary correspondence through the common couriers. All allusions, in letter, which could give a hint of the sending, or a clue to it, could be avoided. The obligation of secresy on the part of all involved, would be made very strict. The reasons for making it a secret then, would be of force, for keeping it a secret, and it is with the air of imparting something secret hitherto, that Melanchthon puts forth his statement years afterwards ! ! !" Whew ! This is a confession, wrung out under pretence of furnishing proof, that in all that generation there was not any "HINT OF THE SENDING, OR A CLUE TO IT." Nobody knew of it, or spoke of it, or wrote of it. It was a profound "SECRET," and remained so for thirty years, without any conceivable reason for the secresy, beyond the immediate occasion of sending, if even then. Why this particular sending was kept so secret, and no other one, that of the 11th of May, the alleged one of the 22nd of May, and Melanchthon's the very day after the Diet, is as great a "SECRET," or inscrutable mystery, as the sending itself. This, if not a "descent from the sublime to the ridiculous," is a descent from the grave to the comical. It is the lamest conclusion ever added to what was designated to be a great argument.

"O, most lame and impotent conclusion !"

For the benefit of our readers we will briefly state a few facts implied in Dr. Krauth's Confession, or capable of proof.

1. Of all who were present at the Diet of Augsburg, or participated in the discussions on the Confession, there is not a single witness to this sending of it to Luther.

2. Luther himself, who lived nearly sixteen years after the Diet, never alludes in any of his writings to this sending.

3. Melanchthon, who lived nearly thirty years after the Diet, nowhere alludes to it—leaving out of question this disputed passage.

4. No historian of the Diet, or of the Augsburg Confession, of that age, pretends anything of the kind.

5. There is no conceivable reason for such silence, after the Diet was over. The Confession was freely sent to Luther and others, and no secresy dreamed of.

6. The whole claim of such a sending rests on this single passage of doubtful application, written by Melanchthon thirty years after the alleged sending : and such a use of the passage seems to contradict all the probabilities as well as the facts in the case.

We took up this pamphlet expecting to find something new on the subject, but we have been disappointed. Instead of proof we find opinions and assertions, instead of arguments abuse, and instead of trustworthy conclusions imaginary possibilities. We had marked a number of points, in addition to those noticed, for criticism, but have neither time nor space at present. In this review we endeavored to avoid all offensive personalities, and not to return 'railing for railing.' If in any instance there may seem to be harshness or severity, it is the severity of simply stating the truth. The case is now submitted to the calm and sober judgment of the reader.

CONTENTS OF NO. IV.

Article. Page

I. How shall we Train the Ministry for the Times, 477

By Rev. James W. Richard, Professor in Carthage College, Carthage, Ills.

II. Ansgar,..... 501

*Translated from the German of Rev. Alexander Michelsen, of Lübeck, by Rev. G. F. Behringer, Indianapolis, Ind.

III. Ascensio Isaiæ,..... 513

Translated from the critical edition of the Ethiopic text of Prof. Dillmann, by Rev. Geo. H. Schodde, A. M., Ph. D., Martin's Ferry, Ohio.

IV. Studies in Gospel Harmony,..... 538

By Rev. W. H. Settlemyer, A. M., Jefferson, Md.

V. The Power of Darkness,..... 550

By Rev. H. L. Dox, Tremont, Pa.

VI. The Fulness of Christ,..... 582

By Rev. N. Van Alstine, Raymertown, N. Y.

VII. Hartwick Seminary,..... 592

By Rev. William Hull, Hudson, N. Y.

VIII. Literary Intelligence,..... 609

American.—Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Historical and Biographical—Miscellaneous.

British.—Biblical and Theological—Philosophy and Science—History and Biography—Miscellaneous.

IX. Notices of New Publications,..... 610

Memoirs of Jean Francois Marmontel—Artist Biographies: Titian, Raphael, Durer, Murillo, Rembrandt, Claude Lorraine, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Michael Angelo, Guido Reni—Memorial and Biographical Sketches—The Iliad of Homer—Lectures on Mediæval Church History—Early Rome—The Student's Ecclesiastical History—Villages and Village Life—Annual Record of Science and Industry for 1877—Sir Walter Scott—Lutheran Monographs.

PERIODICALS.

The "Foreign Quarterlies" and "Blackwood" have reached us regularly, and have, as usual, been filled with interesting and valuable articles, covering a wide range of discussion in literature, science, philosophy, politics, and religion. The various movements agitating English and European society give to these publications at this time special interest. "Harper's Magazine" and "The Living Age" continue to furnish their readers with a rich variety that should please the most fastidious taste. While there has been less than usual activity in book publishing, the magazine and review literature seems to suffer no abatement in quantity or quality.